

IN THE NAME OF JESUS: THE RITUAL USE AND CHRISTOLOGICAL
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NAME OF JESUS IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY

BY

WILLIAM PARKINSON

PH.D. RELIGION
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
2002



DECLARATION PAGE

I, William Parkinson, have composed the following thesis, and it is a sole product of my research. The thesis, and the research that it represents, have not been submitted for any other degree or diploma, except for the Ph.D. in Religion at the University of Edinburgh.

William Parkinson

ABSTRACT

Scholars have long debated the christological processes that brought about the deification of Jesus, as well as whether the very earliest Christians viewed Jesus as a divine being. This present study attempts to answer these questions by examining how the earliest Christians used the name of Jesus, especially in ritual contexts, and then comparing this usage with how Jews utilized the name of God and divine mediator figures, as well as how the larger Greco-Roman world used the names of their deities. By comparing these various religious traditions in terms of how they used the names of divine beings a catalog of phenomenological categories can be produced and used to compare how the earliest Christians used the name of Jesus. Comparison of these phenomenological categories suggests that Jesus was believed to be divine being by the earliest Christians.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the University of Edinburgh for the opportunity to carry out my doctoral studies at New College, and for their assistance in making this study possible. I also hasten to thank the University of Tübingen and the Evangelische Stift, for providing me an opportunity to study, and carry out research, at the university. I would like to acknowledge the help of Prof. Martin Hengel, who provided me prepublication access to the study of Adelheid Ruck-Schröder, as well as offering his advice on this project. I would also like to thank Dr. David Mealand for his assistance and Dr. Richard Bauckham, my external examiner, for his insight, advice, and helpful suggestions. Above all I wish to thank Prof. Larry Hurtado, whose help, guidance, and encouragement, I relied on at every twist and turn in the process of this study. His patient tutelage not only made this study possible, but it also made it an enjoyable experience.

List of Abbreviations

<i>ad haer.</i>	<i>Adversus Haereses</i>
<i>AIT</i>	Montgomery J.M., <i>Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur</i> , University of Pennsylvania, (The Museum, Publications of the Babylonian Section v. III, 1913).
<i>AMM</i>	Dornseiff, F. <i>Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie</i> , B.G. Teubner, Stoicheia #7, (Leipzig-Berlin, 1925).
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang von Romische Welt</i>
<i>AJ</i>	<i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>
<i>Apoc. Mos.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Moses</i>
<i>ATSGN</i>	Giesebrecht, Fr. <i>Die Alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und irhe Religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage</i> , (Königsberg: Von Thomas & Oppermann, 1901).
<i>b.</i>	Babylonian Talmud
<i>BJ</i>	<i>Bellum Judaicum</i>
<i>BIN</i>	Böhmer, Julian, <i>Das Biblische "Im Namen", eine sprachwissenschaftliche Äquivalente imbesonderen Hinblick auf den Taufbefehl Matt. 28: 19</i> , (Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898).
<i>C. Cels.</i>	<i>Contra Celsum</i>
<i>Corp. Herm.</i>	<i>Corpus Hermeticum</i>
<i>DAJZW</i>	Blau, Ludwig. <i>Das altjüdische Zauberwesen</i> , (Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck, 1974. Reprint of 1898 edition).

<i>Dial.</i>	<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>
<i>De anim.</i>	<i>De testimonio animae</i>
<i>De deo Soc.</i>	<i>De deo Socratico</i>
<i>Div.</i>	<i>De divinatione</i>
<i>De operat. daem.</i>	<i>De operatione daemonum</i>
<i>De somn.</i>	<i>De divinatione per somnia</i>
<i>Diog. Laert.</i>	Diogenes Laertius
<i>DNGJHS</i>	Nägelsbach, D. Friedrich. <i>Der Name Gottes und Jesu nach dem Verständnis und dem Sprachgebrauch der Heiligen Schrift</i> . Müller & Fröhlich: München, 1921.
<i>DATSGN</i>	Giesebrecht, Fr. <i>Die Alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage</i> . Königsberg: Von Thomas & Oppermann, 1901.
<i>Div. inst.</i>	<i>Divinae institution's</i>
<i>DNGJNT</i>	Adelheid Ruck-Schröder, <i>Der Name Gottes und der Name Jesu: Eine neutestamentliche Studie</i> , Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999).
<i>Fast.</i>	<i>Fasti</i>
<i>GAOZ</i>	Hopfner, Theodor. <i>Griechisch-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber: Mit einereinghenden Darstellung des griechisch-synkretistischen Daemonenglaubens und der Voraussetzungen und Mittel des Zaubers überhaupt und der magischen Divination im besonderen</i> , (Adolf M. Hakkert: Amsterdam, 1974).

<i>GT</i>	<i>The Gospel of Truth</i>
<i>Haer.</i>	<i>Refutatio omnium haeresium</i>
<i>HN</i>	<i>Natuaralis historia</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>In Cra.</i>	<i>In Platonis Cratylus commentarii</i>
<i>INJ</i>	Heitmüller, Wilhelm. <i>In Namen Jesu: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe</i> , FRLANT 1,2 (Göttingen, Vandoehoek 1903).
<i>INJJE</i>	Untergaßmair, Franz Georg. <i>In Namen Jesu--Der Namensbegriff im Johannesevangelium: eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den johanneischen Namensaussagen</i> , (Stuttgart: Verlag, 1973).
<i>In R.</i>	<i>In Platonis Rempublicam commentarii</i>
<i>In Ti.</i>	<i>In Platonis Timaeum commentarii</i>
<i>j.</i>	Palestinian Talmud
<i>KJ</i>	Lohmeyer, Ernst, <i>Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5-11</i> , (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaft. Phil.-hist. Kl., Jahr. 1927-28, 4. Abh.) (Heidelberg, 1928),
<i>Liv.</i>	Livy
<i>LXX</i>	Septuagint
<i>Menex.</i>	<i>Menexenus</i>

<i>Met.</i>	<i>Metamorphoses</i>
<i>Myst.</i>	<i>De mysteriis</i>
<i>m.</i>	Mishna
<i>NWGAT</i>	Grether, Otto. <i>Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament</i> , (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1934).
<i>Oct.</i>	<i>Octavius</i>
<i>Od.</i>	Eustathius, <i>Ad Odysseam</i>
<i>Quaest. Rom.</i>	<i>Quaestiones Romanae</i>
<i>Quae. et Sol. Gen.</i>	<i>Questiones et Solutiones in Exodum</i>
<i>PDM</i>	<i>Papyri Demoticae Magicae</i>
<i>PGM</i>	Preisendanz, Karl, ed. <i>Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri</i> . B.G. Teubner: Leipzig and Berlin, 1931.
<i>Philops.</i>	Lucian, <i>Philopseudes</i>
<i>Praep. evang</i>	<i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>
<i>RGG</i>	<i>Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>
<i>Sat.</i>	<i>Saturnalia</i>
<i>Sir.</i>	<i>Sirach</i>
<i>SHR</i>	Morgen, Michael. A. <i>Sepher Ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries</i> . Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.

<i>Som.</i>	<i>De Somniis</i>
<i>Syr. D.</i>	<i>De Syria dea</i>
<i>Symp.</i>	<i>Symposium</i>
<i>t.</i>	<i>Tosephta</i>
<i>Tg.</i>	<i>Targum</i>
<i>THWAT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
<i>THWNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament/Theologische Wörterbuch des Neuen Testament.</i>
<i>TNGIW</i>	Niles Prem Daniel, <i>The Name of God in Israel's Worship: The Theological Importance of the Name Yahweh</i> , Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary (Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Dissertation Services, 1998).

PREFACE

In my first semester under Prof. Larry Hurtado I was introduced to the work of Wilhelm Heitmüller. The points of view, and the methods employed by Heitmüller, were stimulating. By the end of my first year a class paper was produced which served as the backbone for my thesis. It was clear from the beginning that the views and methods of the History-of-Religions school had been too long overlooked in recent studies. Along with encouragement and insight from Prof. Hurtado my interest in Heitmüller's work grew. This present study is an outgrowth of that initial introduction to Heitmüller's work.

In terms of my references for this study, all Bible passages are taken from the New American Standard translation, unless otherwise noted. In addition, all passages on the Apostolic Fathers come from the work, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), unless otherwise stated. Furthermore, unless otherwise noted, all citations from the Dead Sea Scrolls come from *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, edited by Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude. Texts not yet published in the *DJD*, were taken from the *The Dead Sea scrolls study edition* by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. In addition, all classical citations, unless otherwise noted, come from the *Loeb Classical Library*. Also, unless otherwise noted, all quotations from the Pseudepigrapha come from *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. I & II, James H. Charlesworth ed., Garden City, New York, 1985. Finally, all abbreviations of classical works follow the convention outlined in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	iv
PREFACE.....	ix

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION.....	1
-------------------	---

OVERVIEW

HISTORY-OF-RELIGIONS SCHOOL.....	4
----------------------------------	---

CHAPTER TWO

THE ROLE OF APOTROPAIC AND NUMINOUS NAMES IN GRECO-ROMAN MAGIC AND RELIGION.....	12
POPULAR BELIEFS CONCERNING NAMES.....	19
SPECIFIC FEATURES OF GRECO-ROMAN MAGIC.....	24

CHAPTER THREE

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN JUDAISM.....	67
<i>STATUS QUAESTIONIS</i>	68
NAME-CONCEPT IN JEWISH FAITH AND PRACTICE.....	76
FIVE FOUNDATIONAL PASSAGES.....	77
NAME-CONCEPT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.....	89
NAME-CONCEPT IN NON-CANONICAL SOURCES.....	95
NAME-CONCEPT IN JEWISH MAGIC.....	104
PHENOMENOLOGICAL USES OF THE NAME.....	111
1) CONFESSING THE NAME.....	111
2) INVOKING THE NAME...../.....	113
3) MAKING AN OATH IN THE NAME.....	122
4) PROPHESYING OR SPEAKING THE NAME.....	126
5) BLESS OR CURSE SOMEONE IN THE NAME.....	127
6) HEALING IN THE NAME.....	131
7) WRITING OF THE DIVINE NAME.....	132

8) CALLING OUT OF THE NAME OVER SOMEONE.....	134
9) 'KNOWING' THE NAME OF GOD.....	137
10) BEARING THE NAME.....	138
11) 'WALKING' IN THE NAME.....	139
12) PRAISING OR GLORIFYING THE NAME.....	140
13) REJOICE IN THE NAME.....	144
14) LOVE THE NAME OF GOD.....	144
15) TO FEAR OR RESPECT THE NAME.....	145
16) CULTIC ACTS CARRIED OUT IN THE NAME.....	145

SUMMARY.....	148
--------------	-----

CHAPTER FOUR

THE NAME OF JESUS IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY.....	150
A. REFLECTION OVER THE NAME OF JESUS.....	152
1) PHIL. 2: 6-11.....	152
2) EPH. 1:18-22.....	169
3) MATT. 1:18-25.....	172
4) MATT. 18:15-20.....	175
5) ACTS 2:16-38.....	181
6) REV. 19.11-16.....	190
7) NON-CANONICAL SOURCES.....	197
8) SUMMARY.....	205

CHAPTER FIVE

PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE NAME OF JESUS.....	207
A. THE NAME OF JESUS AS A <i>MACHTMITTEL</i>	207
1) EXORCISIMS IN THE NAME OF JESUS.....	207
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISION	216
2) HEALING IN THE NAME OF JESUS.....	221
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISION.....	230
B. THE NAME AS A SYMBOL FOR JESUS.....	233
1) SPECIAL SCRIBAL TREATMENT.....	233

a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	244
2) CONFESSING OR DENYING THE NAME.....	251
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	255
C. THE NAME OF JESUS IN SALVIFIC CONTEXTS.....	259
1) CALLING ON THE NAME OF JESUS.....	259
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	265
2) FAITH IN THE NAME OF JESUS.....	267
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	271
3) COMMAND SOMEONE IN THE NAME.....	272
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	273
4) SUFFERING FOR THE NAME OF JESUS.....	274
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	276
5) THANKS OFFERED TO GOD IN THE NAME.....	277
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	279
6) GLORIFYING (PRAISING) THE NAME.....	279
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	280
7) PRAYER IN THE NAME.....	281
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	284
8) TO COME IN THE NAME.....	285
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	286
9) PREACH, SPEAK OR TEACH IN THE NAME.....	286
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	288
10) 'DO ALL' IN THE NAME.....	289
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	291
11) CALLING THE NAME OVER SOMEONE	292
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	294
12) BAPTISM IN THE NAME OF JESUS.....	294
a) ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON.....	302

CHAPTER SIX

THE RITUAL USE OF THE NAME OF JESUS, EMERGENT BINITARIAN CHRISTOLOGY, AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	308
--	-----

APPENDIX ONE

BACKGROUND TO PHILIPPIANS 2:6-11.....	313
---------------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX TWO

DEFINITION OF MAGIC.....	323
--------------------------	-----

APPENDIX THREE

THE TERM 'HYPOSTASIS'.....	326
----------------------------	-----

APPENDIX FOUR

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CULTIC ACTIONS.....	330
---	-----

APPENDIX FIVE

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST.....	332
--	-----

APPENDIX SIX

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN RABBINIC SOURCES.....	338
---	-----

APPENDIX SEVEN

CONJECTURES ON THE ORIGIN OF THE <i>NOMINA SACRA</i>	342
--	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	352
-------------------	-----

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Überschaut man die Wirkungen des Jesus-Namens...so kommt man zu demselben Schluss wie

bei dem jüdischen Schem...: der Jesus-Name, bzw. Der Gebrauch, das Nennen des Jesus-Namens, ist für die alten Christen von früh an ein Sakrament oder Sakramentale gewesen¹

Around 150 C.E. Justin Martyr wrote, "...to the Father of all, who is unbegotten, there is no name given...but Jesus his name as man and savior, has significance."² Justin continues his name-speculation when he later maintains that the name of God was actually Jesus. Justin defended this claim by pointing to the mysterious Angel of the Lord spoken of in Exodus 23, who, it was claimed had the divine name implanted, so to speak, in him. Because the Angel of the Lord led the people of Israel he was viewed as a type of Joshua figure who had likewise led Israel into the Holy Land, and in Justin's chain of logic the fact that Jesus=Joshua was an indispensable piece of the puzzle. From this Justin deduced that the name of God and the name Jesus were one and the same for he states, "for if you shall understand this, you shall likewise perceive that the name of him who said to Moses, 'for my name is in him,' was Jesus."³

These two citations illustrate that with the advent of the Christian faith the curtain did not ring down on the interest and theological speculation over the names of divine figures. These passages display the enormous significance which the Early Church placed upon the name of Jesus. When we trace the roots of this phenomenon we do not have to wait long before we find

¹ Wilhelm Heitmüller, *In Namen Jesu: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe*. FRLANT 1,2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 247-248.

² *Second Apologia* 6. All future quotes taken from the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1986).

³ *Dialogue with Trypho* 75. Several new reviews of Second Temple Judaism have reinforced the notion that intermediate figures, such as the Angel of the Lord, were readily accommodated within the broader Jewish monotheistic framework. Klaus Koch's article, "Monotheismus und Angelologie," goes into some depth concerning the scope of this accommodation, while L. Hurtado discusses the rationale and religious significance of this accommodation. For further reading see Klaus Koch, "Monotheismus und Angelologie," in *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der Israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*, eds. Walter Dirtrich and Martin A. Klopfenstein (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 565-582 and Larry W. Hurtado, *One God One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Christian Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988). It is of some interest to observe that some scholars, such as Fossum, see this Angel of the Lord=Jesus equation as standing behind some New Testament passages. For further details see Jarl Fossum, "Kyrios Jesus as the Angel of the Lord in Jude 5-7," *NTS* 33 (1987): 226-243; and Jarl E. Fossum, "In the Beginning Was the Name: Onomanology As the Key to Johannine Christology," in *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*, (Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Freiburg/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 109-134.

that we have hit solid Semitic bedrock. This speculation, as we will see, was also no less indebted to Greco-Roman conceptions of divine names. Of course, the notion that a religious group should place great emphasis on the name of a divine being elicits no surprise, for the Greco-Roman world had done likewise, as is shown both in first century prayers and incantations, as well as in the slightly later philosophical musings of intellectuals such as the members of the Neo-Platonic school (e.g., Iamblichus, Plotinus, and Porphyry⁴ to name a few).⁵ Judaism too, was not immune from this type of belief, and Christians, no less children of their time, also incorporated this theologoumenon into the fabric of their doctrines and practices, although in the case of Christianity one aspect separated it from its contemporaries; here I refer to the startling fact that Christians had elevated the name of the historical person to a position equivalent to the place which the name 'YHWH' had come to occupy in Judaism. And this remarkable estimation of the import of the name Jesus occurred significantly earlier than the quotations from Justin would suggest. Quite remarkably, the lineaments of this name conception reach into the earliest strata of New Testament tradition. A number of texts illustrate this amply.

For example, within the New Testament we find the claim that the name of Jesus was purportedly used in exorcisms during the ministry of Jesus, by both his disciples (e.g., Mt. 7:22; Lk. 10:17; cf. Mk. 16:17), as well as by those who at first blush appear not to be enfranchised to utilize his name (e.g., Mk. 9:38f. and Lk. 9:49). In the post-Easter era the name of Jesus was the putative source of power by which the apostles accomplished healings and exorcised demons (e.g., Acts 3:6, 16: 4:7, 10, 30: 16:18; cf. 9:34, 19:13), and it was the source of *exousia* and *dynamis* by which some Jewish exorcists (apparently *ex opere operato*) attempted to control demonic powers (Acts 19:13 ff.). And most importantly, in the cultic setting of baptism, the Christian was instructed to invoke the name of Jesus over Christian initiates (James 2:7; cf. 1 Cor. 1:13, 15).

Beyond the strictly numinous qualities that the name of Jesus displays in the New Testament there is also found profound reflection over its significance. For example, in Mt. 1:21

⁴Indeed, Porphyry even wrote a work entitled *Περί Θείων ὀνομάτων*. Hirschle speculates that the work entertained the notion that a divine name could etymologically reveal the nature of the god who bore the name. See Maurus Hirschle, *Sprachphilosophie und Namenmagie im Neuplatonismus: Mit einem Exkurs zu 'Demokrit' B 142* (Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1979), 43.

⁵It is not without passing interest to note that Iamblichus was of Syrian extraction, while Porphyry was Phoenician and Proclus was a Lycian by origin. All of this suggests an 'Orientalism' of Greek philosophical thought. For further details see R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1972), 13.

we read, “And you shall call His name Jesus, for it is He who will save His people from their sins.” And speculation concerning the significance of the name of Jesus is also found in Revelation 19:13, where the author states that Jesus’ name is “The Word of God.”

This emphasis upon the name of Jesus raises several important questions: First, what prompted this sort of belief and where do its roots lie? Second, how did this development progress and can we speak of a 'vector' of progression in its development within Early Christianity? And finally, can this name-speculation shed light on christological belief and development?

Given the prominence that the name of Jesus received in early Christian circles it is surely unfortunate that the topic has received insufficient attention since the seminal treatment of the subject by Wilhelm Heitmüller in his *In Namen Jesu: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe*. Indeed, Heitmüller’s seminal study still casts a lengthy shadow in all discussions on this topic.

This lack of attention is rendered all the more grievous by the fact that Heitmüller’s original enterprise was hamstrung due to a paucity of original source material. Subsequent to his publication we have recovered so much new material that we now have an embarrassment of riches.⁶ In retrospect, we can appreciate that the paucity of Heitmüller’s database was matched only by his brilliance in utilizing such scant material in carrying out his impressive scholarly work; thus, from both methodological and source critical concerns, the time is ripe to revisit Heitmüller’s original study.

Now whatever the shortcomings of Heitmüller’s study he did demonstrate two important facts: first, that the use of the name of Jesus in the New Testament was conditioned in some measure by magical theologoumena such as those found in Hellenistic magical circles,⁷ and

⁶ A rapid inventory of these additional materials will illustrate the voluminous nature of our potential database. We now have the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Nag Hammadi codices, a fuller corpus of Old Testament Pseudepigraphal works in translation, over 8,000 authors and 30,000 extant pieces of Greek literature from Classical times until the end of the Late Antique Era in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, and numerous additions to Preisendanz’s *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, to name just some of these new resources.

⁷ “In Wirklichkeit steht der christliche Namensglaube prinzipiell auf derselben Linie mit dem jüdischen und heidnischen [emphasis mine],” *INJ*, 253. Heitmüller also maintained that from the inception of the statements about the name of Jesus in our earliest sources, until the time of Origen, the view of the name of Jesus was basically magical in nature. I shall challenge this view as it pertains to the New Testament, and if I might be allowed to anticipate my conclusions, the name of Jesus was attached to a form of name-mysticism, but rarely, strictly speaking, to name-magic. I shall unpack this claim later in my study. It should be noted though that Aune accepts

second, we can obtain a greater measure of understanding concerning the significance of the use of the name of Jesus with the help of the estimation granted divine names in the milieu of Early Christianity; that is, by examining Judaism and Greco-Roman perceptions and practices in this area.⁸ Beyond this, one finds another secure postulate which proposed that this usage dates from the very incipit of the Christian movement ‘full blown from the brow of Zeus’ as it were.

Somewhat more dubious however were some of his other conclusions. To cite but one example, Heitmüller was convinced that the all-important baptismal phrase ‘in the name of (someone)’ was of Hellenistic pedigree, and accordingly, was derived from the argot of Greek commerce.⁹

True to his purpose, Heitmüller drew the inevitable corollary that the phrase arose in a Hellenistic Christian setting far removed from Palestinian Jewish Christianity.

Whatever one makes of Heitmüller’s work, the significance of how, and in what fashion, Christians utilized the name of Jesus has potentially far reaching consequences for how we view early christology and the processes which shaped its development. Certainly careful re-examination of how Christians utilized the name of Jesus promises to repay dividends. Now, while it seems certain that such an analysis will show that some of Heitmüller’s conclusions will have to be amended, it must be said that his basic grasp of the christological importance of the name of Jesus was as penetrating as it is enduring. However, before I proceed in outlining the parameters that shall govern this study it is appropriate at this point to introduce a little more thoroughly those scholars who began the type of History-of-Religions investigations which Heitmüller’s work symbolizes.

THE HISTORY-OF-RELIGIONS SCHOOL

Heitmüller himself was just one of a small group of scholars centered at Göttingen (the so-called ‘kleinen Göttinger Facultät’) around the turn of the century who developed both a new

Heitmüller’s conclusion concerning name-magic in at least some passages. This acceptance is, in my judgment, wide of the mark. There are, as we shall see, magical concepts in the New Testament, but name-magic, in its strictest sense, is not found (in an unambiguous manner) in the New Testament except in the Gospel of Matthew 7:22, as I shall show later on. For Heitmüller’s views see *INJ*, 236 and for Aune see David Aune, “Magic in Early Christianity,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt Geschichte und Kultur Rome im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* II.23.2 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980): 1546, 1556.

⁸Wilhelm Heitmüller, “Namenglauben im NT,” in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart Vol.4*, eds. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnach, (Tübingen: J.C. B. Mohr, 1913), 662.

⁹Heitmüller, *INJ*, 106.

emphasis, as well as new critical tools, in the study of religion. These scholars formed what was to become known as the History-of-Religions School. Among the names which have graced the mantle of this school are Wilhelm Bousset, William Wrede, Ernst Troeltsch, H. Gunkel, and Albert Eichhorn, to name but a few. This is an impressive array of scholars, but what exactly were the guiding principles of the History-of-Religion School?¹⁰

Generally speaking their foundation stone was radical historical investigation of both Judaism and Christianity. This emphasis arose from a new era of scholarship in Germany that brought various resources to bear upon the ferreting out of the facts concerning these religions--without concern for their religious implications. This era in German scholarship has been termed by some as 'Wirklichkeitswissenschaft' and entailed not only the recovery of historical facts, but inevitably led to a partitioning and flourishing of numerous disciplines (e.g., archeology, philology, and the like), which were used to serve the ends of the School. The School's methodology purported to investigate every aspect of religion without prejudice towards any belief in its claimed supernatural origins; indeed, this pre-supposition was often called into question.

The chief tool of the School was the use of a historical approach whereby one religion was illuminated by comparing it to the developmental processes and patterns as found in another religion, hopefully one roughly coterminous with the religion under study.¹¹ Their primary emphasis did not lie in the study of comparative religion per se, but rather in laying bare the historical events and milieu of their subject in order to better comprehend the meaning of ritual actions and popular belief.

Another characteristic of the school was its emphasis upon fleshing out the common piety of the people, especially the functional role which cultic acts played in popular religion¹² This

¹⁰The term itself evidently first arose from Gunkel's essay in *ThLZ* (1899) 15:369-371, entitled "Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie." More precisely he termed this new methodology "religionsgeschichtlicher Methode." As quoted in Karsten Lehmkuhler, *Kultus und Theologie: Dogmatik und Exegese in der religionsgeschichtlichen Schule* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 25 fn. 54. For the other particulars mentioned here see Gerd Lüdemann, *Die "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule." Facetten eines theologischen Umbruchs*, Studien und Texte zur religionsgeschichtlichen Schule Band 1, ed. Gerd Lüdemann, (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996), 11.

¹¹Lüdemann, *Der Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule*, 10.

¹²M. Dibelius, a second generation advocate of the School's methodology, sums up this emphasis in the following manner. "Zugrunde liegt der k[ultgeschichtliche]n M[ethode] ebenso wie der formgeschichtlichen die

emphasis focused not so much around the concern to systematize each and every act carried out in the cultus, but more generally was aimed at identifying characteristics and properties of the cultus of both Judaism and Christianity.

Furthermore, among cultic rituals, special emphasis was laid upon sacramental acts. These acts were described by Pfister as any "...magische(r) oder kultische(r) Akt, der den Menschen in eine innige Beziehung und Verbindung mit dem Göttlichen setzen, der auf irgendeine Weise die heilige Substanz auf den Menschen übertragen, ihn heiligen soll."¹³ As Pfister's quote demonstrates, the proponents of the School chose to classify magic and cultus together for both were considered part of folk tradition and customs.¹⁴ Now let us look at the School's most important member, in terms of christological thought.

Unquestionably the most significant member of the School, with respect to the study of christology, was Wilhelm Bousset. Bousset is rightly credited as having instituted the first programmatic approach in the modern pursuit of christological inquiry.¹⁵ Bousset advanced a diachronic, phenomenological, and geographically orientated model, which utilized religious and historically comparative materials in order to situate properly christological development within its wider context.

Bousset clearly came to rely upon ritual practices as a primary tool in helping to explicate the contours of the process that brought about the deification of Jesus. In keeping with other members of the School, Bousset saw these practices as a potent generator of christological innovation.

By careful use of these principles Bousset believed that he was able to place the epicenter of christological development in Antioch. In Bousset's view there was a christological fault line which separated Palestinian Judaism from Diaspora Judaism and it cut right across Antiochian

Erkenntnis, daß die Religion für den Historiker nur in ihren Ausdrucksformen zu erkennen ist, und die andere, daß unter diesen Formen die wichtigsten die sind, die die engste Beziehung zum praktischen religiösen Leben des Kultgläubigen haben." As quoted in Lehmkuhler, *Kultus u. Theologie*, 35. Original source is M. Dibelius', "Kultgeschichtliche Methode," *RGG*, Band 3,2 (1929 edition), 1338.

¹³ As quoted in Lehmkuhler, *Kultus u. Theologie*, 41.

¹⁴ Lehmkuhler correctly notes that the School subdivided religion into holy men, holy texts or words, and holy traditions and customs. It is in this last group that both cultus and magic were placed. See Lehmkuhler, *Kultus u. Theologie*, 39.

¹⁵ Larry Hurtado, "Christ-Devotion in the First Two Centuries: Reflections and a Proposal," *Toronto Journal of Theology* 12/1 (1996): 17-33.

soil. According to Bousset each new christological wave that swelled from Antioch became increasing more paganized in terms of the pristine monotheism, which Bousset maintained, was normative for Palestinian Judaism. According to Bousset these christological innovations were carried across the Levant, and eventually the whole of the Mediterranean, through the efforts of the Apostle Paul and others like him.¹⁶

In retrospect it is now easy to see that Bousset's methods made for quite heady wine. His appeal to primary literature, the simplicity of his guiding principles, and most importantly, the broad framework that seemed to explain readily a host of sometimes perplexing facts, render his methods, even today both stimulating and promising.

In spite of the initial success of the School, in time, their approach largely fell out of favor among scholars. This descent was signaled with the publication of Oscar Cullmann's widely influential 1957 study, "Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments," which began the trend toward limiting the range of inquiry to the New Testament in isolation from other non-Christian sources of the era, denying scholars the possible insights that might have been derived from the very Greco-Roman world which provided the populace from which early Christianity drew its adherents. This new direction also eschewed any focus on ritual practices, or other phenomenological aspects of early Christian life. Since Cullmann the study of christology has been congested with inquiries which emphasize, among other aspects, the titles afforded Jesus in the New Testament,¹⁷ sketches of particular christological concepts such as preexistence, or alternatively attempt a book-by-book doctrinal study. All of these attempts seek in some fashion to delineate how various New Testament authors treated the person of Jesus. In my view this type of approach to christological inquiry has bequeathed to us a narrow methodology which does not easily allow the investigator to form a unified picture with respect to Christianity 'on the ground' as it were.

¹⁶Wilhelm Bousset, *Kurios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, trans. John E. Steely (New York: Abingdon, 1970), 146-147.

¹⁷This type of approach attempts to ascertain how the various titles of Jesus function in the New Testament. See for example Werner Kramer, *Christos, Kurios, Gottessohn. Untersuchung zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den vorpaulinischen Gemeinden* (Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1963); F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel; ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); Klaus Berger, "Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel," *NTS* 17 (1971): 391-425; and O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press; London: SCM Press, 1963; Originally, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, 1957).

Frankly, this lack of a wider systematic approach has not been productive enough in helping us understand that most complex of mutations, viz. how a crucified religious deviant came to be viewed as the preeminent representative and revealer of the divine reality and intent. While no one doubts that these sorts of studies have contributed greatly to our knowledge about certain authors, and their respective beliefs, they have not done enough in adding to our knowledge about *how* early Christians came to deify Jesus. Unfortunately we now stand before the prospect that by continuing to adhere to this methodology we face ever diminishing returns.

Fortunately recent stirrings in the field have again called for a return to the approach of the older School. Modifications and refinements of the History-of-Religion School's methods have come in recent years primarily from Larry W. Hurtado and Gerd Lüdemann.

In Lüdemann's case he concludes first and foremost that students, as well as teachers, must understand the *Umwelt* of early Christianity, not only as the primary component of their research, but he also advocates that they beg off understanding this *Umwelt* as mere background material because it will tend to give the false impression that Christianity does not belong *with* this background.¹⁸ As such Lüdemann advocates that students chiefly concentrate upon learning about religions of the Hellenistic Era, as well as concentrating upon the literature generated during this time span.¹⁹

The second direction suggested by Lüdemann is that a greater consideration of political, social, and economic conditions be taken into account with reference to the New Testament, as well as its impact upon early Christianity.²⁰ It is worth noting however that Lüdemann does part company with the prior History-of-Religion School in that he sees a peril in situating the *Sitz-im-Leben* for early Christian literature creation exclusively within the cultus. Lüdemann prefers as a source the rather more comprehensive area of the cultural-political life that then prevailed.

Lüdemann's third consideration is to point out the need to return to investigating the influence of religious experiences and practices in the Early Church, and connected with that, the religious-psychological aspects that such experiences may have produced.

¹⁸Lüdemann, *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, 19.

¹⁹*Ibid.*

²⁰*Ibid.*, 20.

Lüdemann also contends that Christianity should be seen as a religion which is to be understood in psychological terms; indeed, its birth and growth explained *within* these terms, instead of appealing to supernatural forces.²¹

The final position that Lüdemann stakes out is that he also sees the need for a wider approach that occupies itself with the history of early Christianity, in its broader terms, rather than restricting the investigation by focusing in on New Testament authors alone

The other noteworthy call for change comes from Larry Hurtado. In Hurtado's research one of his main concerns was to understand and appreciate how religious experiences might have contributed to christological development. For Hurtado religious experiences played an *early* formative role in helping to shape christological development. Hurtado states that:

This explanation of the Christian mutation, as based upon religious experiences that had creative effects upon the interpretation of the inherited tradition, is usually not offered in much scholarly writing on Christian origins. But such an explanation, I suggest, not only accords with the information we have about the nature of early Christian groups but also helps to account for the sudden and rapid development of christological beliefs and Christ-orientated devotional practices within the first decades of the Christian movement.²²

In nuce, Hurtado's thesis posits that religious experiences were a potent seminal force which helped propel christological development. In this respect Hurtado has drawn a contiguous line between his approach and that of the History-of-Religions School. Beyond this, Hurtado also sees the need to return to the methods of the old School, with the caveat though that such work is attended by our improved understanding of Judaism and its relationship to Greco-Roman religious thought.

With respect to my own views let me briefly say that in terms of methodology I welcome the following aspects of the History-of-Religions School approach. First, their emphasis upon a historical-critical approach, which attempts to come to grips with Christian development by recourse to a diachronic investigation, although I still retain many reservations about many of their conclusions. On similar grounds I endorse the History-of-Religions School's attempts at situating the development of christology within the matrix of the larger Greco-Roman milieu,

²¹ Ibid, 11.

²² Hurtado, *One God One Lord*, 122.

although at the same time I object to their over-emphasis upon mystery cults and other Greco-Roman religious movements to the relative neglect of Jewish elements and Jewish traditions.²³

Third, I commend their emphasis upon taking into account the wider phenomena that characterized early Christian piety and religious life, especially cultic activities such as worship, prayer, and rituals. It was this emphasis which allowed the adherents of the History-of-Religions School to propose various factors which would explain the development of Christ-devotion.

In my judgment, in our attempts to understand the origins and development of emergent Christ-devotion we must cast our net beyond investigation of christological doctrine, or individual New Testament authors alone, and instead widen our inquiry so as to encompass the religious life of early Christians. Only by recourse to this broader line of inquiry will it be possible to ascertain all of the causal factors that fueled christological development.

Accordingly, my investigation shall be governed by the principles of the History-of-Religions School, but with the necessary modifications which I hope will allow me to avoid the errors into which they fell, viz. over reliance upon Greco-Roman parallels, uncritical use of late parallels to illuminate early developments, and the belief that Judaism had been so Hellenized as to have lost its more profound spiritual precepts. Accordingly, in my study I shall embrace the major pillars of the old School, viz. a diachronic approach, an attention to comparative religious materials and their provenance, and a focus on phenomenology.

Moreover I shall assume the following four dictums put forth by Hurtado concerning the development of Christ-Devotion in the first two centuries.²⁴

- 1) There were the Biblical and Jewish religious traditions, which supplied major religious ideas and categories for early Christian religious life and thought.
- 2) The development of devotion to Christ in the first several centuries was "heavily fueled by the need to accommodate Christ as divine without departing from a monotheistic outlook."²⁵

²³Indeed this aspect of their methodology led the adherents of the History-of-Religions School to posit that the entire development of Christ-devotion was little more than a progressive paganization of Christianity brought about by the corrupting influences of Hellenistic thought and religious practice.

²⁴ Larry Hurtado, "Christ-Devotion in the First Two Centuries," 24-25.

²⁵ Ibid., 24.

- 3) Investigators must allow for the influence of the general religious atmosphere, which has the capacity for providing both categories and conceptions for religious innovation, even if on occasion it was by way of reaction against these very features in pagan religious practice.
- 4) Aspects of religious beliefs and practice, that is to say, the powerful input of religious practices, must be taken into account in our attempts to describe the emergence and development of Christ devotion.

In order to pinpoint securely the christological significance of the early Christian use of the name of Jesus in the larger christological framework I must first seek to establish its significance in light of its historical parallels in the Greco-Roman milieu. In this pursuit I shall begin with a review of the significance of divine names in Greco-Roman magic and cultus.²⁶ Secondly, I shall examine the Jewish materials for evidence of how numinous names were used in cult and magic. Furthermore, I shall canvas the Old Testament and Intertestamental materials to see how Old Testament Israel regarded the name of God. Thirdly, I shall define and categorize early Christian usage of the name of Jesus by examining New Testament texts, and then those texts, canonical and non-canonical, from early Christianity which offer some additional insights into how the earliest Christians regarded the name of Jesus.

After reviewing these texts I shall partition the various uses of the name of Jesus into their respective categories in order to bring illumination from the History-of-Religions investigation of step one to these materials. And finally, I shall attempt to 'parse' christologically the significance of the use of the name of Jesus in the theological understanding of early Christianity. From this foundation I shall draw my conclusions concerning the christological significance of the early Christian use of the name of Jesus. In addition, the ritual use of the name of Jesus will receive particular attention. This will help us to see what role the name-concept can play in fleshing out the details of christological development. With that said, I shall now proceed to examine the Greco-Roman materials.

²⁶ For the interested reader I include an appendix which takes up the question of the role and function of cultic acts in religion. See Appendix Four.

CHAPTER TWO

THE USE OF NUMINOUS NAMES IN GRECO-ROMAN MAGIC AND RELIGION

Man kann sagen, die Zauberkunst ist die Wissenschaft von den göttlichen Namen.²⁷

This section inaugurates my attempt to flesh out the name-concept utilizing a history of religions approach, as well as my attempt to anchor this material within the greater context within which the concept originated. This first subsection will deal with the name-concept as it is found in Greco-Roman religion and magic.

My first task will be to review the *status quaestionis* on this subject, and then proceed to sketch the contours of the name-concept as it is found in Greco-Roman society, generally speaking. After this general introduction I shall make a more detailed and specific attempt to trace the name-concept within Greco-Roman magic and religion proper.

Status Quaestionis

In the following review I aim to highlight the work of those scholars who have devoted significant attention to either the role of the name-concept in Greco-Roman magic or to some component element which can be tied into Greco-Roman name-mysticism.

It is an unfortunate fact that over the years divine names in Greco-Roman magic have received little systematic treatment. This is not due to lack of notice by scholars of Greco-Roman magic. On the contrary, all scholars that I have reviewed are in agreement concerning the importance of divine names. Still, the subject is often mentioned only in passing with very few scholars ever attempting to treat the matter systematically. However, several works which have helped to establish this consensus on the importance of divine names stand out as worthy of mention.

Unquestionably, the most exhaustive and detailed examination of the function and role of divine names was offered in 1921 (and 1924 for volume II) in the seminal and massive two-volume work of T. Hopfner.²⁸ In his first volume Hopfner devotes a full section to the question

²⁷ Benno Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes: eine sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten und Neuen Testament* (Berlin: S. Calvery & Co., 1903), 102.

²⁸ Theodor Hopfner, *Griechisch-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber: Mit einer eingehenden Darstellung des griechisch-synkretistischen Daemonenglaubens und der Voraussetzungen und Mittel des Zaubers überhaupt und der magischen Divination im besonderen*, ed. R. Merkelbach (Amsterdam: Adolf M Hakkert, I=1974, II = 1983; reprint, Leipzig: Haessel, I=1921, II=1924), § 693. A much briefer version of Hopfner's study can be found in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie*. See Theodor Hopfner, "Mageia," in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen*

of the name-concept in Greco-Roman magic. Briefly Hopfner advances the following propositions.

First, after exhaustive review of the available evidence Hopfner concludes that the name of a divinity represents, or is a symbol of, the nature and essence of the divinity (“*zwingenden inneren Sympathie des Namens mit seinem Wesen*”).²⁹ Secondly, Hopfner comes down on the side of the proposition that the use of the name of the divinity could coerce the divinity to execute the wishes of the suppliant.³⁰ Beyond this, Hopfner held to the view that the petitioner must have possession of the ‘true’ name of the divinity in order to have power over it.³¹ A correlative of this concept is that since only the true name carries the actual numinous force the name must be kept secret, both by the hierophant and the tradents of the magical arts as well.³² To do anything less was to invite disaster for if the true name were to fall into the hands of a rival theurgist, or a political enemy, the name could be employed to the detriment of the devotee. Interestingly, Hopfner explains the origin of this conception by recourse to simple human psychology. In brief, Hopfner thought that since many people at one time or the other had experienced unanswered prayer (or invocation) then this failure was deemed to signify that the name which they were using must not be the correct ‘true’ name of the god. Conversely, if any name were valid then all prayer would go heeded and that clearly was not the case.³³ Accordingly, successful invocation was predicated upon knowing the true name of the divinity.

Altertumswissenschaft Band 14 pt. 1, eds. Georg Wissowa and Wilhelm Kroll, (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlerische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928), 334-342.

²⁹Ibid., § 688.

³⁰Ibid., § 690. Hopfner further observes that this control can operate either with the consent of the god, or against its will. Still, Hopfner avers that in the cultic setting the gods do not come out of compulsion but rather the petitioner is prepared to receive the god and draws attention to themselves through the κλήσεις. See § 794.

³¹Ibid., § 687.

³²Ibid., § 695. Prümmer also concurs, “Natürlich gilt gerade die Kenntnis solcher Namen als Berufsgeheimnis der Zauberer.” See Karl Prümmer, *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch für den Raum der Altchristlichen Umwelt* (Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut, 1954), 372.

³³ Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 682. The dilemma which arose in such occasions was whether the petitioner must be compelled to believe on the strength of the evidence of unanswered prayer either that their deity did not exist, or that they had simply erred in the use of the name(s) of the god. As already noted, Hopfner’s clever proposal was that people who had experienced these episodes resorted to reliance upon the notion that the reason the god(s) had not answered was simply because the petitioner had not utilized the correct ‘true’ name of the deity.

Furthermore, Hopfner concluded that in general terms the more powerful the god was conceived to be, then the more powerful its name was believed to be.³⁴ Hopfner also maintained that the name of a deity was widely believed to carry an apotropaic force which was effective against both illness and evil spirits.³⁵ Hopfner also observed that the name was widely assumed to have numinous qualities and was held by some to have an independent existence apart from the bearer of the name (i.e., a 'true' hypostasis).³⁶

Hopfner further notes that it was rather common in Greco-Roman antiquity to substitute one name for another name if the substitute was of an equal numerical equivalence as demonstrated by onomatomantic procedures.³⁷

Finally, Hopfner notes that review of the magical papyri, gems, *tabulae execrationum* and the like deliver justifiable warrants for the establishment of the belief that the names of the gods were revealed by the gods themselves for only they were privy to their own 'true' names.³⁸

The other great work in this area was that of Heitmüller. Insofar as I shall have a chance to delve into Heitmüller at depth a little later on I shall bypass a more involved inspection at this point.

Another contribution of particular note is Bietenhard's detailed article on the use of religiously significant names in Greek, Jewish and Christian circles.³⁹ Although his work breaks no new ground it is nevertheless useful to take into account Bietenhard's evaluation of the evidence with respect to the magical use of names.

Bietenhard maintained that the magical papyri yields evidence for the existence of the theologoumenon that invoking the name of a deity could force the deity into pliancy with the

³⁴Ibid., § 701.

³⁵Ibid., § 691.

³⁶Ibid., § 693.

³⁷Ibid., § 705.

³⁸Ibid., § 758, cf. Proclus *In Cra.* 72.8ff. and *In Ti.* III 32.18f. Indeed, the whole 'art' of magic was believed to have been revealed by the gods. Graf gives a brief overview of literary documents where this notion is discussed. See Graf, *Gottesnähe und Schadenzauber*, 85-89.

³⁹Hans Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, V (1954): 242-281.

wishes of the suppliant.⁴⁰ Moreover, Bietenhard also held that only the 'true' name of the god had efficacy, and consequently, must be utilized by the petitioner.⁴¹ Finally, Bietenhard conjectures that in antiquity divine names were often viewed as a type of hypostasis of the god.⁴²

I should also mention the very interesting article of Pulleyn. Pulleyn's article attempts to show that the belief in the ability of numinous names to compel the gods was quite alien in the Classical Greek religion of Hesiod and Homer.⁴³ It is not the purpose of my work to enter into this debate, but I think that Pulleyn has demonstrated that in *Classical* Greek religion this belief existed at best only in incipient form. However, of some interest is Pulleyn's assertion that the name-concept existed in fully figured form by the advent of the Hellenistic era-in particular in the arena of Hellenistic magic.⁴⁴

Moreover, Pulleyn throws in with other scholars and concludes that the name-concept was a normative component of Egyptian religion.⁴⁵ To this Pulleyn adds the further observation that Jewish religious scruples concerning the Tetragrammaton helped to fan into flame the Hellenistic Greek belief in the power of numinous names.⁴⁶

There are yet several other particulars about the name-concept in Greco-Roman magic which I must attend to as they are addressed in the odd article or chapter but deserve to be covered, for each contribution, in its own way, has informed and illuminated some aspect of magical praxis in Hellenistic times. In the following summation I shall review not authors, but rather individual aspects of name-mysticism.

With respect to the question as to whether divine names were considered numinous in Greco-Roman magic the answer is quite unequivocal. All investigators that I have examined are

⁴⁰Ibid., 250.

⁴¹Ibid., 251.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Simon Pulleyn, "The Power of Names in Classical Greek Religion," *Classical Quarterly* 44 i (1994): 17-25.

⁴⁴Ibid., 23.

⁴⁵Ibid., 19. Perhaps by extension one might conclude that Pulleyn is implicitly endorsing the notion that the origin of name-mysticism is to be found in Egyptian religion.

⁴⁶Ibid.

agreed that certain names were in fact considered, by at least some practitioners of the magical arts, as possessing numinous qualities.⁴⁷

There also appears to be a consensus regarding the question of whether the prospective supplicant must utilize the 'true' name of the god in order to receive a satisfactory response.⁴⁸ From this it can be deduced that the practitioners of magical arts must keep the names of the deities shrouded in secrecy in order to safeguard the power which was resident in the name from either enemies, or unscrupulous practitioners, not to mention reckless neophytes.⁴⁹

In regards to the question of whether certain names could actually coerce the gods, a consensus again appears to emerge. All investigators that I have been able to examine agree that adepts believed that they could gain traction in their bid to compel the deity by invoking the correct name.⁵⁰

Furthermore, every investigator that I have examined has been moved by the data to agree that divine names were believed to be apotropaic.⁵¹ Those investigators who attempt to

⁴⁷Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 681, 687; idem., "Mageia," 336; Bietenhard, "ἄνομα," 251. So also Burkhard Gladigow, "Götternamen I," in *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der Antiken Welt*. Band 6 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1996): 1202-1238; Jacob, *ING*, 78 and Campbell Bonner, *Studies in magical amulets chiefly Greco-Roman* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1950), 215. See also in this respect Hermann Güntert, *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister: Bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Homerischen und Eddischen Göttersprache* (Halle: Max Niemeyer: 1921), 9.

⁴⁸Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 687; idem., "Mageia," 334; Bietenhard, "ἄνομα," 251; Heitmüller, *INJ*, 206-207; Wilhelm Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens im Kult und Aberglauben: Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Volkskunde*, Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Grossherzoglichen Ludwig-Georgs-Gymnasiums und der Vorschule der beiden Gymnasien zu Darmstadt, (Darmstadt: G. Otto Hofbuchdruckerei, 1912), 34; Rudolf Hirzel, *Der Name: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte im Altertum und besonders bei den Griechen* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1962), 19-20; and C. Detlef G. Müller, "Göttesnamen IV," in *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der Antiken Welt*. Band 6 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1996), 1242.

⁴⁹Bonner, *Amulets*, 173; Hirzel, *Der Name*, 122; Giesebrecht, *DASGN*, 89, 91; Bietenhard, "ἄνομα," 243; Hopfner, *GAOZ*, § 695; idem., "Mageia," 337 and Kurt Aram, *Magie & Zauberei in der Alten Welt*, (Wiesbaden: Fourier Verlag, 1998; Reprint of 1927 edition), 77.

⁵⁰Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 688, 690; idem., "Mageia," 336; Jacob, *ING*, 78; Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 28; Heitmüller, *INJ*, 206; F. Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, *Stoicheia* #7 (Leipzig-Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1925), 54; Bietenhard, "ἄνομα," 250; Karl Prümm, *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch für den Raum der Altchristlichen Umwelt*, (Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut, 1954), 371-72; Burkhard Gladigow, "Götternamen I," 1207 and Aram, *Magie & Zauberei in der Alten Welt*, 77.

⁵¹Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 689; Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 44 and Heitmüller, *INJ*, 211.

trace the origin of name-mysticism appear unified in positing ancient Eastern cultures-especially Egypt-as the source,⁵² although the influence of Babylon is also undeniable.⁵³ Another area of considerable agreement occurs in the acceptance that the ancients believed that the gods and demons spoke their own language, which in some cases stemmed from the area of the origin of the divinity or demon.⁵⁴

One area with some contention is whether numinous divine names were thought of in hypostatic-like terms.⁵⁵ On this score the scales are mostly weighted toward those who think that numinous names were indeed thought of as being genuine hypostatic entities.⁵⁶

In view of the lack of systematic treatment by all but Heitmüller and Hopfner, I will proceed by identifying the constituent elements of Greco-Roman name-magic,⁵⁷ which are of some relevance to my overall argument. Accordingly, in this section I shall attempt to trawl the relevant primary literature in an effort to display clearly the following categories of concrete aspects of Hellenistic magic and its various modes of application.

Briefly stated, in my own perusal of Greco-Roman magical texts I have been able to delineate twelve elements of Greco-Roman magical praxis which are of some import for my analysis. These twelve points are as follows:

⁵²Jacob, *ING*, 86-90; Hopfner, *GAOZ*, § 720; Heitmüller, *INJ*, 218-222; Joshua Trachtenburg, *Jewish magic and superstition; a study in folk religion*, (New York, Atheneum, 1970), 87, 133; and Ludwig Blau, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen* (Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck, 1974, Reprint of 1898 edition), 133. It is interesting to note that Trachtenberg even goes so far as to claim that the *nomina barbara* (i.e. non-Greek names of the gods) can be traced to an Egyptian provenance. Trachtenberg concludes that the *nomina barbara* were originally intelligible but subsequently degenerated into unintelligible form when they put down roots in Greek soil. See *Jewish magic and Superstition*, 82, 87.

⁵³Jacob, *ING*, 82-83; Heitmüller, *INJ*, 185-190, and Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic*, 87.

⁵⁴Jacob, *ING*, 100 and Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 720.

⁵⁵I use the term 'hypostasis' in the sense of Olyan's category of "divinization." I also adopt his term "particularizing manifestation" to describe situations where metaphorical language is being employed (= 'special figurative treatment'). For more on Olyan and the classification that I use see Appendix Three.

⁵⁶Albrecht Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, 3rd ed, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), 114; Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 87; Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 695; Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 257, and Heitmüller, *INJ*, 212.

⁵⁷With the term 'magic' I refer to the belief that the gods could be coerced to answer favorably a request or demand by the adept because a certain medium was employed, or a specific formula was followed or a special name utilized. For more on the definition of magic see Appendix Two.

1) The names of the gods and other supernatural agents were considered to be numinous and laden with power. 2) The names themselves were often thought to have an autonomous existence apart from the designated god or demon. 3) The names of the gods were indissolubly intertwined with the gods themselves, so much so that to control the former was to control the latter. 4) Foreign names and words (*nomina barbara*) were viewed as having more supernatural vitality than commonplace names. 5) Pursuant to point four, the rationale for the emphasis upon foreign names was in part due to the fact that magic in general, and the name-concept in particular, were heavily indebted to Eastern (especially Semitic and Egyptian) pollination of Greek religion. 6) The power, which was resident in the name, remained so only if the original language was utilized, or at least transliterated into the magical *lingua franca* of the theurgist. In part this concept is derivative. Insofar as the gods, as well as the demons, were viewed as having originated in specific geographic areas it appeared to the masses that they naturally responded to their 'native tongue'. 7) It was imperative for the supplicant to ascertain the 'true' name of the god or demon. True names allowed for greater control over the numinous realm, per point 3. 8) The invocation of numinous names was arguably the major means in securing apotropaic power on behalf of the petitioner. 9) It was necessary for the god to reveal its 'true' name for only he or she was privy to it. 10) Some theurgists believed that they could generate a state of *sympatheia* with, or special recognition from, the gods or demons by demonstrating their proficiency in correctly apprehending, and adroitly applying, the appropriate rituals, appurtenances, sigla, *historiolae*, and invocational formula in order to win approval of the deity. 11) For many votaries a more profound apprehension of the mystery of the god or demon was often believed to be facilitated by utilizing onomatomantism (i.e., 'divining' the deity through gematria). The number of the god or demon could be seen as being tantamount to a revelation about the nature of the divine being. 12) The most efficacious name for tradents of the magical crafts was usually thought to be those associated with the Tetragrammaton or its profane surrogates.

While I need not rigidly adhere to the order of this outline, it should be borne in mind as I proceed to review the data. For the purposes of expediency in this review I shall group both literary and non-literary sources together and treat them as a whole. Before I begin this review it would be helpful to submit a brief introduction on the general function and significance of names in the Greco-Roman world before, and concurrent with, the era of my concern. Thereafter I will undergo a more detailed analysis of the name-concept in Greco-Roman magic and religion.

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT POPULAR BELIEFS CONCERNING NAMES IN GREEK THOUGHT

In Greek thought a name could signify a person or thing.⁵⁸ More importantly, the name was thought to be representative of the nature, or essence, of the person or object so named.⁵⁹ It could be used in idioms as well as to signify the nature of an object or relationship. Even Greco-Roman society followed this line of reasoning when it named entire groups according to the founder, as for example, Christians were named after Christ. We have in view here several aspects. First, the founder was viewed as the example to which the followers were to aspire. Secondly, the founder was memorialized by the use of his or her name by their followers.

One example for my first point is found in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* 905 where Pylades speaks of safe withdrawal from the land of the barbarians and he refers to this flight to safety as an ὄνομα τῆς σωτηρίας (i.e., here salvation is found in the context of safety-that is, escape from enemies is physically salvific).⁶⁰ As the representation of the person, the name could be used as a surrogate of sorts for the person, for example in laying a charge to the account of the person (i.e. in the name of the person) who purchases an object, or solicits a service.⁶¹ It could also, of course, be used in simply calling on a person, or more importantly, invoking the gods.⁶²

In addition, for the Greeks names could take on many meanings depending on the context. To cite but one author, Thucydides in his *Peloponnesian War* (5.16), shows that a name could be used as a signifier for the reputation of a person or group, for concerning the Athenians he writes when addressing their good reputation that they possess, τὸ μέγα ὄνομα τῶν Ἀθηναίων. Conversely, as in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* 6.4,7 we find that a person or object could possess a dishonorable name (ἐν ἀτίμῳ ὀνόματι).

⁵⁸ The Greeks and Romans assigned certain names because they believed that names were intimately connected with the nature of a person as Homer's *Odyssey* 9.16-20 shows.

⁵⁹ Bietenhard, 243. See also Hermann Güntert, *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister*, 7.

⁶⁰ Some manuscript witnesses read ὄμιμα instead of ὄνομα.

⁶¹ Ibid., 244-245.

⁶² Ibid.

Names could of course capture the essence of a person or thing.⁶³ For example, when Socrates in the *Cratylus* is asked by his friend Hermogenes about the names of the gods, Socrates answers that “Names rightly given [are] the likeness and images of the things which they name...imitation of the essence is made by syllables and letters.” (439A; 424b-425A).

Other aspects of the name-concept in everyday Greco-Roman life can be seen from the Greek practice of naming their children after either the attribute that they desired for their child, or choosing a name that was intended to provide protection from the spirits.⁶⁴ This may have as its origin the notion that the act of naming was actually synonymous with creation itself, a view widely held in Antiquity.⁶⁵ Examples of this type of naming are Kleon and Themistokles to indicate glory, Kratinos and Polycrates to indicate power, and to signify their hope that their child will possess some good attribute parents chose names with the Eu-prefix such as Eutychos. In fact, Schmidt points out that when a child would die prematurely the parents would often ascribe the death to an unlucky name which they had chosen.⁶⁶ Even the gods followed suit as seen in, for example, Hesiod’s *Theogony* 408-409 where the goddess Phoibe is said to bear a child with the name of Asteria “whose name brings good luck.”

In addition, theophoric names, or names which were used to represent a religious conversion, were often used to signify that a person had entered into a new relationship or position with respect to the gods.⁶⁷

Other aspects of the name-concept include what was arguably the most important area in the life of the ancients-warfare. It is worth noting in this context that the names of the first soldiers chosen to make contact with the enemy had inscribed upon their breast shield a *bonum nomen* (e.g. Cicero, *De divinatione* I §102, cf. Artemidorus’ *Oneirocritica* 38). Similarly, Livy

⁶³ Nägelsbach has correctly noted that names often times signify not so much the essence of the thing named, but rather some particular characteristic. See Friedrich D. Nägelsbach, *Der Name Gottes und Jesu nach dem Verständnis und dem Sprachgebrauch der Heiligen Schrift* (München: Müller & Fröhlich, 1921), 3.

⁶⁴ See Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 11-20.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 27.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 10.

⁶⁷ See G.H.R. Horsley, “Name Change as an Indication of Religious Conversion in Antiquity,” *Numen* Vol. XXXIV (1987): 1-17.

claims that if a general bore an unlucky name his soldiers would refuse to follow him into battle (*Liv.* 28 28.4).

Philosophers also occupied themselves in addressing the meaning and essence of names. At issue was whether names adequately reflected the true nature of an object or person. This problem was compounded by the fact that some objects bore more than one name.

Further complications arose from the fact that many bad things bore good names and vice versa-and this occurred, in the minds of some, because the gods, who had created language had themselves erred in the process of naming the various material objects!⁶⁸ Other considerations, such as the perception that the name of something stands as the contrast, indeed the antithesis, to the true nature of the object (so Parmenides, 8.38), only served to confound philosophers. Worse yet was the perception that humans call an object one thing, while the gods utilize another name, and this only exacerbated the lack of resolution of the philosophical problem concerning the nature and function of names.⁶⁹

Plato in his *Cratylus* (435d) also took up this argument over what names really mean. In this work Plato combats the assertion of Cratylus that knowing a name is tantamount to knowing the thing, for Plato asserts that those who create names may have seriously erred in representing the object or person. For Plato, human reason could not penetrate behind the veil which hid the true recognition of names and their true meaning.⁷⁰ Ultimately, words were nothing more than auditory representations of objects and accordingly the names of these objects received their meaning through reason and customary use.⁷¹

With respect to religion it should be observed that the Greeks, in parallel with Jewish practice, utilized theophoric names to name their children (e.g., Iunius for the god Iuno and Venerius for Venus, etc.). As adults the bearer of a theophoric name was thought to convey the divine presence of the divinity in religious or cultic activities.⁷²

⁶⁸Bietenhard, “ὄνομα,” 246.

⁶⁹ This carried with it the presumption that the names used by the gods were the correct ones.

⁷⁰As quoted in Bietenhard. See, “ὄνομα,” 247.

⁷¹ Ibid., 247.

⁷² Ibid., 38.

What I wish also to highlight is the heretofore-unattended aspect of the name-concept with respect to the hierophant or the participants during cultic veneration of a deity. For example, Pliny records in his *Naturalis Historia* 38.22 that the person chosen to bring the offerings to the altar must bear a name rich with religiously significant meaning. Likewise Tacitus, in his *Histories* 4.53, states that the soldiers who bore the foundation stone for the construction of the Capitoline Temple bore so-called *fausta nomina*; that is, names which signified good fortune.⁷³

As for the gods, notwithstanding the report of Herodotus, speculation concerning the names of the classic pantheon of the gods originated with the *Theogony* of Hesiod. We witness, for example, in the *Theogony* (188-198) Hesiod's attempt to explain the etymology, and the significance, of the name of Aphrodite.

Other authors speculated that even the names of the gods were less than perfect for they reflect only one facet of the god. Beyond this some were convinced that the gods had reserved their true names for themselves and thus humans were bereft of any knowledge of the actual names of the gods (*Cra.* 400d-401a). Nor were matters rendered more clear when the gods received more than one name, as can be seen for example with Posidonius, who states that Zeus was named Δία, because all things had come into being through him, and Ζηνα, because he was the source of life.⁷⁴ For others, such as Plato, the only valid names of the gods were those which the gods used for themselves (*Cra.* 400d-401a).

As can be seen here the gods received many names based on their respective activities, ranks, and attributes. This is seen clearly in the later remarks of the pagan scholiast Lactantius Placidus⁷⁵ (ca. sixth century C.E.), who comments that divine names connote the essence of the god(s) as Orpheus, Moses, and Isaiah recognized:

But perceive the true state of affairs: Is it possible to know the name of this god, who by his very nod rules and keeps everything together, to whose judgment all is subject,....But since the Magi wanted, as they thought, to grasp his virtues....and they tried to denote by the name of God the noble array of many deities, whose names were drawn from the

⁷³ Other examples are noted in Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 20.

⁷⁴ Cited in *Diog. Laert.* 7.1.68.

⁷⁵ I accept the measured assessment of Stern that Placidus was a non-Christian. See, Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980), 682 n. 1.

performance of many things [i.e., their attributes as seen in their actions]. Thus did Orpheus and Moyses, the priest of the Highest God, and Esaias and their like.⁷⁶

Naturally, all of this led to the antithesis, ὄνομα-φύσις, becoming a hotly discussed topic among some philosophers, especially the Sophists.⁷⁷ We see this concern clearly in Euripides' optimistic assessment that ὀνόματι μεμπτόν τὸ νόθον, ἢ φύσις δ' ἴση.⁷⁸

It is interesting to note that originally the Roman pantheon of gods did not even have proper, personal names, but rather had names that only reflected their class.⁷⁹ As for the Greek gods, if we look beyond Hesiod or Homer, we find a curious lack of interest in the personal names of the gods.⁸⁰ It would seem that some Greeks simply invoked "the god" or "the goddess."⁸¹ The evidence suggests that it was not until the time when eastern religious influences could percolate into Greek society that the idea of invoking the god by its 'true' name became customary.⁸²

As for how names came to reflect the relationship between mankind and the gods it should be observed that a devotee and a divinity could exchange names, thus indicating an essential oneness between both parties. Moreover, there was also the prominent custom in antiquity of changing the name of a person when their nature or their position before God had changed.⁸³ As we shall see in the section on the Old Testament such practices were also commonplace in the Semitic world. I shall now turn my attentions to the more specific features of Greco-Roman magic.

⁷⁶ *Ad Statius Thebais* 4.516: Cum magi vellent virtutis eius, ut putabant, sese comprehendere, singulas appellationes quasi per naturarum potestates abusive modo designarunt et quasi plurimorum numinum nobilitate Deum appellare conati sunt, quasi ab effectu cuiusque rei ductis vocabulis, sicut Orpheus fecit et Moyses summi Dei antistes, et Esaias et his similes. The translation above is drawn from Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 685.

⁷⁷ Bientenhard, "ὄνομα," 246-247.

⁷⁸ As quoted in Bientenhard, "ὄνομα," 246.

⁷⁹ See H.J. Rose, "Divine Names in Classical Greece," *Harvard Theological Review* 51 (1958): 10.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 28.

⁸³ Examples are cited in Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 22.

SPECIFIC FEATURES OF GRECO-ROMAN MAGIC

Despite an undeniable divergence in some details within magical praxis from the Hellenistic and Imperial eras there are in my judgment certain recognizable traits that attain such currency of usage that a remarkable consensus of utilization is obtained.⁸⁴ I shall first introduce a representative sample from the *PGM* that amply demonstrates the power of numinous names in magical incantations. This will serve only as a general introduction to the non-literary material with which I will be interacting, as well help the reader to see the typical beliefs which gave birth to Greco-Roman magic. Thereafter, I will review the various magical precepts concerning numinous names in their respective categories, first in light of the literary evidence, followed by the light shed by non-literary sources. I shall be looking to establish the twelve points that I have already outlined briefly above.

Perhaps the best place to begin is with a perusal of the Hellenistic magical text known as *The Eighth Book of Moses Concerning the Holy Name* (*PGM* XIII. 1-720), for it well encapsulates many salient features of Greco-Roman magic.⁸⁵ Its comprehensive treatment of many magical beliefs will hopefully deliver a finer-grained portrait of magical praxis. Fortuitously, almost every detail is coated in the amber of tradition. While its provenance is unknown⁸⁶ the magical text (and its intercalated paean to the gods) instructs the initiate about the accoutrements of magical praxis. Pivotal in this text is the position placed upon the names of the gods in obtaining compliance with the supplicant's requests. Indeed, even the incipit concerns itself with knowledge about the holy Name. The Name itself is all encompassing (345-346), and is worthy to be hymned (637), as even the Muses do (788-789). And, in a recurrent motif quite at

⁸⁴Certainly there is a conservatism or stasis at work in magic despite its well-documented tendency towards syncretism. Thus, words and names seem to have always played a central role. For a more thorough exposition on this matter see John M. Hull, *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition* (London: SCM Press, 1974), 20-27 and Arnold, *Colossians*, 19-20.

⁸⁵The heavily Semitic nature of this spell tempts one to assign this text to a Jewish provenance. However, as noted by both Goodenough and Nock, Semitic features are so prominent in almost all magical texts that there is no reliable criterion for determining the actual provenance of this text. Moreover, the text was preserved in a pagan collection which demonstrates that, irrespective of its original provenance, this text resonated with the non-Jewish conventicle which preserved the text. Since this is the only assured datum point that can be secured, I believe that caution mandates that this text be allotted with our section on Hellenistic magic. For further details on these particulars see John G. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), 135-36.

⁸⁶The text begins with $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$, which according to Betz, possibly betrays an Athenian origin. See Hans Dieter Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation including the Demotic Spells*, 2nd Edition, V. 1, Texts, ed. Hans Dieter Betz, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 172 n.1.

home in the *PGM*, the true name of the god is indispensable for success (622).⁸⁷ In addition, the various other magical names in the text are described as great (53; 183; 505), holy (183; 505), glorious (183; 505), and fearsome (505).

The zenith of this commerce of the divine is the reception of the Name from the god (210-212; indeed obtaining knowledge of the name of the god was highly coveted; cf. LXXI.7-8), and the practitioner was solemnly charged to keep the Name secret (755). Furthermore, the members within the conventicle also kept the power of the Name in trust (740-742). With the Name any request is rendered possible. Whether one desires invisibility (235-237), the securing of a lover (238), the driving away of demons (243), to bring about a healing (247), or to ward off imprecations directed toward the practitioner—simply wear the Name inscribed upon papyrus around your person (253). The various names are able to fulfill these requests because they are powerful (460-462).

This text allows us to see the central role which divine names usually played in Greco-Roman magic. With this general introduction behind us, I shall now delve into the various specifics of the magical name-concept in Greco-Roman magic and religion.

Within the economy of the divine the names of the gods or their principal agents were often construed as being the principal medium of exchange between mankind and the divine, for names carried numinous, apotropaic, and even divine attributes.⁸⁸ This is clearly demonstrated to be the commonplace reality of Hellenistic magic,⁸⁹ and magic itself was an integral aspect of Greco-Roman society in the Hellenistic and Imperial Era. As Clement, in his *Stromata* (II.I) notes, the Greeks were quite enamored with magic:

We must also treat of what is called the curriculum of study—how far it is serviceable; and of astrology, and mathematics, and magic and sorcery. For all these the Greeks boast as the highest sciences.

⁸⁷This claim that spurious names are less desirable than 'authentic' names is echoed in *PGM* V.115-120; IX.14; XII.92-94); *PDM* xii. 112-118.

⁸⁸Graf states in this regard that "Die Magie...kennet eine Reihe von Wegen, um zu übermenschlicher Macht zu gelangen; der effizienteste und verbreitetste ist der, in den Besitz des geheimen Namens einer mächtigen Gottheit [emphasis mine] zu gelangen; wer den Namen kennt, kann diese Gottheit anrufen, er kann mit ihm aber auch die niederen Wesen einschüchtern." See Fritz Graf, *Gottesnähe und Schadenzauber*, 88.

⁸⁹An interesting statistic which underscores the prominence of the name-concept in Hellenistic magic is that the word ὄνομα occurs approximately 400 times in Preisendanz's registry of terms for the *PGM*.

A fitting companion statement is found in Psellus', *On Demons according to the Dogma of the Greeks*, where it states that "magic according to the Greeks is a thing of very powerful nature for they say that it forms the last part of the sacred sciences (ἱερατικῆς ἐπιστήμης)."⁹⁰

As the evidence stands, it appears that its reach extended into every nation and culture, irrespective of whether any nation or group had even established contacts with one another, as Pliny's comments demonstrate:

Certainly Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, and Plato went overseas to learn it [magic],...taught it openly upon their return and considered it one of their most treasured secrets...So universal is the cult of magic throughout the world, although its nations disagree or are not known to one another.⁹¹

Two points clearly emerge: first, those who trafficked in such elements did not acknowledge any national or geographic barriers when it came to plying their trade. And secondly, the constituent elements of magic were so readily grasped intuitively that its form, though variegated in part, was liable to convergence even in minute elements of both ritual and belief.

Foremost among these common elements is the invocation of the names of the gods to facilitate preternatural activity.⁹² This commonplace has two major facets: first, the preponderance of Hellenistic (and Late Antique) incantational texts maintain that by means of proper invocation (i.e., utilizing an often confusing pastiche of names of various gods)-that is, knowing the 'true' name of the god, the theurgist could mediate a positive response. Indeed, such incantations could even coerce the gods.⁹³ Clearly, proper invocation was predicated in Hellenistic times upon the widely held premise that names were magical and numinous, not just personal signifiers of their respective bearers.

⁹⁰As quoted in Thomas Taylor, *Iamblichus On the Mysteries of the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Assyrians*, translated from the English by Thomas Taylor, 3rd edition, ed. R.I. Robb, (San Diego: Wizards Bookshelf, March 1997; reprint of second edition, London: Bertram Dobell, 1895), 221.

⁹¹NH 30.2. 8-9; 4.13. As an indicator of the antiquity of magical arts in Greece Pliny states that Homer reports that Ulysses used an invocation to place in abeyance a hemorrhage that resulted from a blow to his thigh. Actually, it was the sons of Autolycus who performed the invocation on Odysseus, but Pliny's point remains well taken. See the *Odyssey* 19. 457.

⁹²The concept that the gods could be 'called down' by invocation has a long and storied pedigree. For examples see Livy 1.20 and Ovid *Fast.* 3.321.

⁹³Also the thrice-repeated ritual invocation of the name of a deceased person could effect this force over the gods. Several examples of this phenomenon are cited in Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 36-37.

Put in other terms, the issue was as much one concerning the medium of invocation (i.e., the use of the correct numinous names) as it was an issue of engendering *sympatheia* with the god, or at least recognition, through strict adherence to magical rites. Another aspect was the belief in the efficacy of *nomina barbara* (foreign and unintelligible words, as well as foreign names of the gods),⁹⁴ which were enhanced if they were employed in strictly recited formulas (συνθήματα), or spells (ἐπωδαί).⁹⁵ I shall have more to say concerning this matter at a later stage in this survey.

In concert with my first point I should note that divine names themselves were often seen as having power over the gods. To unveil this belief in numinous names I note the narrative of Lucian (ca. 150), that prominent cynic of the supernatural realm, who in his *ΦΙΛΟΨΕΥΔΗΣ Η ΑΠΙΣΤΩΝ* (otherwise known by its Latin title, *Philopseudes sive Incredulus*) plays the protagonist for the materialistic view when he castigates Deiomachus for being mendacious and believing the commonplace, viz., that names have supernatural power over illness. In his narrative concerning the curing of an illness Lucian challenges Deiomachus to prove that this accepted premise is more than simple superstition in the following manner (9):

If...you do not first convince me by logical proof that it takes place in this way naturally, because the fever or the inflammation is *afraid of a holy name* [ὄνομα θεσπέσιον; emphasis mine] or a foreign phrase [ῥῆσιν βαρβαρικῇν] and so takes flight from the swelling...

Deiomachus for his part protests against such unbelieving effrontery and replies (10):

It seems to me that when you talk like that you do not believe in the gods either, since you do not think that cures are effected through holy names (ἱερῶν ὀνομάτων).

Lucian, in purposeful parody of what he believes the ignorant masses should be disabused of, viz. superstition, yields another story through his fictitious interlocutor Ion (who supports the

⁹⁴The origin of these foreign names is still a contested issue. Versnel suggests that they may be corruptions of the *Ephesia Grammata* which later became construed as being foreign names. As this development progressed other names were eventually added. See Hendrik S. Versnel "Die Poetik der Zaubersprüche," in *Die Macht des Wortes*, ed. Tilo Schabert & Rémi Brague, (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1996), 245.

⁹⁵The importance of accurately pronouncing the formula and names, as well as following the exact prescript, is seen most clearly in the great demotic magical papyrus, where over the lines of the *nomina barbara* and the *voces magicae* we find written out the phonetically exact Greek letters in order to guide the theurgist in the correct pronunciation. I am indebted here to Kákosy's book, which mentions this fact. See László Kákosy, *Zauberei im alten Ägypten*, trans. from the Hungarian by Eszter Szóbel and Ildikó Derzsi, (Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1989), 121.

received position on these things). Ion has just finished recounting one miraculous tale and now he unravels another concerning a Babylonian who had called out all the snakes from a farm (12):

Perhaps this is nothing out of the common [supernatural events];...But the Babylonian did other things that are truly miraculous. Going to the farm in the early morning, he repeated seven sacred names (παλαιᾶς ὀνόματα ἑπτὰ καὶ θείῳ) out of an old book...going about three times and called out all the reptiles that were inside the boundaries. They came as if they were being drawn in response to the spell...

Even some Christians were in agreement, as Origen, in an illuminating discourse on the divine power resident in names, tells us in his *C. Cels.* (I.24):

If, then we shall be able to establish...the nature of powerful names, some of which are used by the learned among the Egyptians, or by the Magi among the Persians, and by the Indian philosophers called Brahmins, or by the Samanaeans...and [we] shall be able to make out that the so-called magic is not, as followers of Epicurus and Aristotle suppose, an altogether uncertain thing, but is, as those skilled in it prove, a consistent system, having words which are known to exceedingly few; then we say that the name's Sabaoth and Adonai...are not applicable to any ordinary created thing, but belong to a secret theology which refers to the Framer of all things. These names, accordingly, when announced with that attendant train of circumstances which is appropriate to their nature, *are possessed of great power* [emphasis mine]; and other names, again, current in the Egyptian tongue, are efficacious against certain demons who can only do certain things; and other names in the Persian language have corresponding power over other spirits; and so on in every individual nation, for different purposes. And thus it will be found, that, of the various demons upon the earth, to whom different localities have been assigned, each one bears a name appropriate to the several dialects of place and country.

Origen takes up this same line of reasoning in order to create a more persuasive polemical argument which would deal in a more comprehensive manner with the Christian injunction which prohibited Christians from applying the names of the Greco-Roman gods to either YHWH or Jesus. Origen, in his revealing rejoinder to Celsus (*C. Cels.* V.45), observes concerning the numinous nature of divine names:

And now we maintain that the nature of names is not, as Aristotle supposes an enactment of those who impose them. For the languages which are prevalent among men do not derive their origin from man, as is evident to those who are able to ascertain the nature of charms which are appropriated by the inventors of the languages differently according to the various tongues, and to the varying pronunciations of the names of which we have spoken briefly in the preceding pages, remarking that when those names which in a certain language possessed of a natural power were translated into another language, they were no longer able to accomplish what they did before when uttered in their native tongue....if anyone either in an invocation or in swearing an oath, were to use the expression, 'the God of Abraham,' and 'the God of Isaac,' and, 'the God of Jacob,' he would produce certain effects, either owing to *the nature of these names or to their*

powers, since even the demons are vanquished and become submissive to him who pronounces these names [emphasis mine], whereas if we say, “the god of the chosen father of the echo....the mention of the name is attended with no result, as is the case with other names possessed of no power...

The non-literary evidence also abundantly supports this view of divine names as numinous agents. To begin I cite *PGM XIII.735-740*, where the mentor instructs his pupil to:

Take, child, for this personal vision, [a list of the gods] ...and the seven-letter name...which [name] is great and marvelous, as it is what brings alive all your books.

Further evidence of this phenomenon is found in a ca. third century C.E. *defixio*, unearthed near Oxyrhynchus, where there is this adjuration in the malediction:

I adjure you spirit of the dead man, *Antinoos*, by the Name that causes fear and trembling, the Name at whose sound the earth opens, the Name at whose terrifying sound the spirits are terrified, the Name at whose sound rivers and rocks burst asunder.⁹⁶

Another notable malediction, which was exhumed near Carthage in North Africa, and dates to approximately the third century C.E. has the *defigens* of this imprecation state that:

I bind you AÔABAÔTH, the god of this day in which I bind you. I bind you ISOS [Jesus?], the god who has power over this hour in which I bind you...I utter to you the true Name that shakes Tartarus, earth, the deeps, and the heaven...⁹⁷

Finally, in a consecration for an Eros statue (*PGM XII.84-85*; Eros functions here as a *πάρεδρος*) the claim is made that the entire cosmos is subject to the great name which the petitioner invokes. “I conjure you by the [holy] and precious name to which all creation is subject.”⁹⁸

On this showing it is now possible to take up my earlier contention that the knowledge and utilization of the names of the gods could be used to control them. My first witness comes from Eusebius, where he takes as his fount of knowledge certain statements made by Porphyry

⁹⁶John G. Gager, *Curse Tablets and Binding spells from the Ancient World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 99-100. For other examples see pgs. 183-184, 231-232, and *PGM XII. 238-244* and *XXXVI. 260-261*.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, 63. I cannot help but speculate whether the early practice of inscribing the name of the god on the outside of the tablet in purposeful imitation of addressed correspondence may have helped facilitate the emphasis on the role of divine names in Greco-Roman magic, especially in the development of *κατάδεσμοι*. Faraone cites an excellent Attic example of this sort of tablet. See Christopher A. Faraone, “The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells,” in *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic & Religion*, eds. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 4.

⁹⁸Original text is as follows: ὀρκίζω σὲ κατὰ τοῦ (ἁγίου) καὶ κατ’ ἐπιτίμου ὀνόματος, ᾧ ἡ πᾶσα κτίσις [ὑ]πόκειται πασυχθῶν.

about the beliefs of Pythagoras concerning the gods. The topic at hand was the effect of incantations on the gods. Eusebius quotes Porphyry to the effect that:

This is also rightly declared by Pythagoras of Rhodes, that the gods who are invoked over the sacrifices have no pleasure therein, but come because they are dragged by a certain necessity...For as Pythagoras had made these statements, I learned by close observation of the oracles, how true his words are. For all the gods say that they have come by compulsion...For they give out answers for their own compulsion, as will be shown by Apollo's answer as to [the] means of compelling him. It is expressed thus: 'Strong to compel and weighty is this name.'⁹⁹

And he adds further that "...what utterly perplexes me is, how, though invoked as superiors, they [i.e., the gods] receive orders as inferiors."¹⁰⁰

That divine names could serve as instruments in Hellenistic magic can also readily be observed in a variety of non-literary incantation texts. For the votary the knowledge of the name of the divinity granted access into the portals of the numinous realm where they could obtain the answers to their needs. For example, in *PGM* XII.116-120 (cf. I.205-215; *PGM* IV.1747-1820, 3270-71) the theurgist implores the god to:

Hear me, because I am going to say the great name, AÔTH, before whom every god prostrates himself and every demon shudders, for whom every angel completes those things which are assigned...

In addition to what has already been catalogued I add *PGM* VII. 691 (third century C.E.), where the supplicant reveals his confidence that his request will be heeded:

Because I call upon you with your holy names [ἐπικαλοῦμαι σε τοῖς ἁγίοις σου ὀνόμασιν] at which your deity rejoices, names which you are not able to ignore...

Yet again the theme of controlling a numinous being by knowing and invoking its name is found in *PGM* IV. 1530-1535 (a ca. second century C.E. φίλτρον):

[incipit with instructions] While offering it over coals recite the spell....[various requests concerning a girl]. And remain in her heart and burn in her guts, breasts and liver...because I adjure you, Myrrh, by three names [invocation of the names], and by the more coercive and stronger names KORMEIOTH IAO SABAOTH ADONAI so that you may carry out my orders, Myrrh.

And *PGM* XIII.753 again certifies the binding power of divine names, where we read:

⁹⁹ *Praep. evang.*, 5.8, a, b, c.

¹⁰⁰ *Praep. evang.* 5.10, d. Proclus, in line with other Neo-Platonic philosophers, also held to this view. Divine names were a type of σύμβολα that could be used to call up the gods (e.g. *In Cra.* 31:4, 31:25). In fact Proclus preferred the so-called δεῦτερα ὀνόματα-the names of demons-which were more effectual in moving the gods for these beings stood in closer relationship to the gods than mankind and their names were therefore better than the common human names for the gods. See *In Cra.*, 32.13.

There are also prefaced four other names...And for the compulsive spell you should use the great Name which is Ogdoas,¹⁰¹ the god who directs all things throughout the universe...

In addition, the suppliant believed that he or she could compel compliance of the gods by knowing not only the names of the gods but also their sigla and accoutrements (*PGM* III. 494-500):

Come to me...air traversing great god. Hear me in every ritual which [I perform], and grant all the [petitions] of my prayer completely, because I know your signs / forms, who you are each hour and what your name is.

Finally, I cite *PGM* VII. 893-894, where the adept declares,

...send forth your angel from among those who assist you...because I adjure [you] by your great names, because of which no aerial or infernal daimon can ignore you.

There can be no equivocation that these texts witness to the notion that anyone making an entreaty expected that by calling upon the 'great and mighty names of the gods' they were compelling the gods to become responsive.

We see here that the key phrase "because I call on your true name(s)" is indicative of the belief that the gods could not ignore the invocation for their numinous names had been invoked and consequently they were drawn to the petitioner to do his bidding. Traces of this belief are found all over the *PGM* and attest to its centrality.¹⁰² In light of this evidence I shall end this first section by drawing attention to Hopfner's instructive assessment which merits citation:

Der Gott selbst hört entweder seinen wahren und geheimen Namen gerne und erfüllt dann gerne und freiwillig das Gebet, oder er tut das auch gegen seinen Willen, da er muß, denn dieser Name ist ein Zwangsname.¹⁰³

In addressing my second point, viz., whether divine names were considered discrete from the divinity, careful examination of non-literary materials is called for, especially given the claims of Hopfner on this matter. I shall look to answer the following question: was the name of a divine being sometimes viewed as existing apart, or acting independently from, the god or goddess and was it an instrument of supernatural activity?

¹⁰¹The formal name 'Ogdoas' here connotes a set of eight Egyptian gods which exemplified a sort of yin-yang, male-female, primordial principle. Later, in Gnostic thought, the Ogdoas represented the final 'perfect' heaven (one step beyond the fabled seven heavens of the normal cosmos), a destination for enlightened Gnostics. See Betz, *Greek Magical Papyrus in Translation*, 189 fn. 112.

¹⁰²See for example IV.870-875, 1535-1540, 1810; V.3267-3272 and XXXVI.346-350.

¹⁰³Hopfner, "Mageia," 336. See also *GAOZ* § 688.

One criterion, first proposed by Hopfner, is that when a numinous name appears to have been conceived as being restricted to a specific geographical area then we must, perforce, be open to the notion that the numinous name was believed to be a discrete physical entity.

Even more compelling is Hopfner's second proposed criterion, which maintained that when a divine name is appealed to *directly* to carry out the petition of the practitioner, as opposed to simply using the name to call up the divinity, this then demonstrates its 'hypostatic' nature (my terminology). To answer whether such criteria apply to Greco-Roman magic I must again consult the texts of the *PGM*.

With respect to Hopfner's second criterion I take up the two texts (*PGM* IV.1190 and VII.388, a charm for love) that Hopfner cites to support his view. Both are cited here:

I adjure you, holy names of Cypris, that, if you descend into the innermost part of her,...make her love [me].

And,

You are the holy and powerful name considered sacred by all the angels; protect me...from every excess of power and every violent act. (IV. 1180-1193)¹⁰⁴

In my own review of the primary sources I have been able to locate other examples of this phenomenon. For example, the adepts in *PGM* XII.132-137 and XIII.997-1003 sound similar views, where in the first example it reads:

O sacred names of the god, listen to me-you also, O Good Daimon...listen to me: go to him, NN, into his house, where he sleeps, into his bedroom, and stand beside him, causing fear and trembling, by using the great and mighty names of the gods.

And,

The great Name, that in Jerusalem, by which they bring out water when there is none in the cistern: ACHME IEEO IEEO IARABBAO YCHRABAOA, do the NN thing..., unutterable Name of the great god [ὄνομα ἄφθεγκτον μεγάλου θεοῦ].

The catholicity of this magical belief is again demonstrated in *PGM* CI.51-3 (cf. *PGM* 1190-1193; VII 496-502), where the suppliant calls upon:

You, these holy names and these powers, confirm and carry out this perfect enchantment; immediately, immediately; quickly; quickly.

In addition, a *defixio* from the fourth century C.E. binds an adversary through this oath, "I place an oath on you by the names of the all-seeing god.... You holy names and powers, be strong and carry out this perfect spell. Now. Now. Quickly. Quickly."¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴Cf. VII.495-504.

Lastly, but of particular interest, is the spell from Hadrumentum (ca. third century C.E.).¹⁰⁶ The primary interest here is that it is the Tetragrammaton itself which is directly invoked. The text reads: ὁρκίζω σε τὸ ἅγιον ὄνομα ὃ οὐ λέγεται.¹⁰⁷ All of these examples lend credence to Hopfner's conjecture. In my estimation, these texts encourage our acceptance of Hopfner's criterion for identifying a 'true' hypostasis from exaggerated rhetorical flourishes.

As for Hopfner's first criterion, that at times divine names seem to be viewed as occupying specific geographic areas or space, there are several examples which seem to attest to this phenomenon. In *PGM* VIII.6-10 the aspirant prays, "[come] to me NN, lord Hermes, and give me favor... beauty of face, strength of all men and women. Your names in heaven: [*voces magicae* follow]. These are the [names] in the 4 quarters of heaven." And in *PGM* XXXVI.165-169, the petitioner claims that he should receive protection, "because I glorify your sacred and honored names, which are in heaven."¹⁰⁸ Another example is found in the *Papyri Osloenses* (I.177) where we read, "...muzzle the mouths which speak against me because I glorify your holy and glorious names which are in heaven."¹⁰⁹

With respect to Hopfner's claims what is not readily clear in these latter examples is whether we are encountering merely rhetorical flourishes in these texts or a true enshrinement of the name as a sort of discrete entity. While it is tempting to negotiate away this evidence I think we must resist any such effort. I base my own favorable judgment on this matter primarily in light of the phenomenon which we have witnessed where we see the theurgists addressing the name itself rather than utilizing the name to call down the deity. I find this criterion particularly weighty and feel that even a cautious reading of the papyri proves to be highly suggestive. The criterion of 'discrete localization' (for lack of a better term) is perhaps less compelling than Hopfner's other criterion, but still suggestive. Whatever else may be said, these texts testify to

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 104; cf. the almost identical statement in *PGM* C.5-6.

¹⁰⁶ John G. Gager, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells*, 112.

¹⁰⁷ Presumably YHWH is meant in light of the incipit which invokes the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the fact that in the preceding line the Name is described as that ὃ οὐ λέγεται. As quoted in Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 704, who in turn draws from Wunsch "Antike Fluchtafeln," 23 and the scholia for line 20.

¹⁰⁸ There are other examples in the *PGM*, such as *PDM* xiv.252. Also Hopfner's work contains several other examples. See *GAOZ*, § 693.

¹⁰⁹ As quoted in S. Eitrem, *Papyri Osloenses Fasc. I, Magical Papyri* (Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi I Oslo, 1925), 27.

the belief that certain names were stronger than others and that correspondingly these names were always to be preferred, for they gave the theurgists the necessary leverage in helping to move the gods.

With respect to my fourth point given earlier in the outline I shall now revisit the claim in these texts that the supplicant could only purchase divine interaction by adjuring the divinity by its (conventionalized) magical name(s), the so-called *voces magicae*.¹¹⁰ These often consisted of invoking *nomina barbara* (foreign non-Greek names of divine beings) while implementing incantations,¹¹¹ a practice which may, interestingly, predate Greco-Roman usage.¹¹² In any case, numerous examples can be culled from Greco-Roman sources.

One example comes from Apuleius' *Apologia* (38); a spirited and erudite self-defense against the charge brought by Aemilianus that he was a magician. More expressly, the objection was that he had bewitched a wealthy, older woman into marrying him. In the narrative Apuleius is called upon to defend himself against a seeming preoccupation with fishes. The fish enter into his trial because fish were believed by some to have magical properties and by extension, Apuleius' interest in them demanded an explanation. Apuleius goes on to explain to his judge Maximus Claudius that his interest was intellectual only and that he stands in the same ichthyologic tradition of study as Aristotle, Theophrastus, and other successors of Plato, all of whom had written treaties on animal anatomy and habits. Apuleius then enters into a discussion on the various classes of fish known to him, but equally unknown to his judges and accuser.

¹¹⁰ For the interested reader I note here the work of Versnel which discusses the various functions of the *voces magicae*. See Versnel, "Die Poetik der Zaubersprüche."

¹¹¹ The *nomina barbara* first appear during Classical times. Euripides, in his *Iphigenia among the Taurians* (1336ff.), mentions that Iphigenia, while preparing the sacrifices of Orestes, "shouted out barbarous words, as a true witch." It is worth noting that with the possible exception of the Ephesia Grammata, only at the advent of the Christian Era do the *voces magicae* and various *nomina barbara* appear *en masse*. In contrast, reliance upon divine names appears to begin just prior to the Christian era. For example, in our two oldest magical papyri (XL, third century B.C.E. and XX, ca. 200 B.C.E.) we find no use of numinous names. By the time of the production of CXXII (PGM VIII and first century B.C.E.) the recipes are already flush with divine names. On the *voces magicae* see William Brashear, "The Greek Magical Papyri," 3430.

¹¹² It may be that several passages, in an interesting presaging of the so-called *nomina barbara* (foreign unintelligible divine names), found in several pyramid texts already contain untranslatable words--something also found in the Book of the Dead (chapters 163-167). Brashear reports that by the second millennium foreign and bizarre terms were incorporated into both Assyrian and Egyptian magic. It may also be noteworthy that perhaps another early reference to the *nomina barbara* may be found within the Old Testament itself, at Isa. 8:19, where the prophet decries the claims of wizards by claiming that they "...peep and mutter...", a possible allusion to utilization of *nomina barbara*. For more details see Brashear, "The Greek Magical Papyri," 3429.

Aware that the unintelligible words that he will now use to classify these organisms will be misconstrued as magical terms he puts in a sarcastic dig at his listeners in the following manner, “Listen now to what I am going to say. You will presently [no doubt] cry out, that I am repeating a string of magical terms [lit. names] after the Egyptian or Babylonian custom.”¹¹³ Further light is also shed by Lucian who also relates that he knew of an apotropaic incantation which consisted of magical names (see *Philops.* 17).

Indeed, many believed the gods could even be coerced into subservience by these incantations as Hippolytus takes pains to stress:

ἐπωδαῖς ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν πρὸς τὸ κυριεύειν τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ ποιητῶν τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου.¹¹⁴

And Pliny the Elder recites the common observation concerning incantations used by some theurgists to coerce the gods in the *NH* (28.4.6):

It is not easy to say whether our faith is more violently shaken by foreign, and unpronounceable words, or by the unexpected (lit. peculiar) Latin ones... being always on the look-out for something big, *something adequate to move a god, or rather to impose its will on his divinity* [emphasis mine].

Another example is delivered by Pausanias who relates the story of a Persian named Lydia who, while in the Temple at Hierocaesarae caused the wood on the Altar to be consumed through “invocation of a divinity and a foreign and completely unintelligible incantation.”¹¹⁵

A further example can be culled from Lucian in his satirical *Menippus* (9), where Lucian recounts the magical machinations that must accompany Mennippus if he is to descend successfully into the underworld. Menippus solicits the aid of a magician who, after performing the requisite rituals, divulges the proper incantation to call up the Tormentors and the Furies:

‘Hecate [queen of the] dark night, and dread Persephone,’ [and] with a string of other names, foreign, unintelligible, and polysyllabic (βαρβαρικά ὀνοματά καὶ ᾄσημα καὶ

¹¹³Original passage reads: *magica nomina Aegyptio vel Babylonico ritu*. The translation derives from *The Works of Apuleius comprising the Metamorphoses, or Golden Ass, the God of Socrates, the Florida, and the Defense, or a Discourse on magic. A New Translation. To which are added, A Metrical version of Cupid and Psyche, and Mrs. Tighe's Psyche, a Poem in six cantos.* (London: George Bell and Sons, York Street, Covent Gardens, 1878), 286. No translator is cited, but this work comes from the old Bohn's classical library.

¹¹⁴ *Haer.*, 7.20. “And (they [magicians] are in the habit of invoking the aid of) subordinate demons and dream-senders, and (of resorting to) the rest of the tricks (of sorcery), alleging that they possess power for now acquiring sway over the Archons and makers of this world, nay, even over all the works that are in it.” Translation from *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. V.

¹¹⁵ *Περιήγησις τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (*Description of Greece*) 5.27.

πολυσύλλαβα). As he ended, there was a great commotion, [the] earth was burst open by the incantation...for almost all was now unveiled to us...the lake,...[and] the abode of Pluto.

Lucian reiterates this theme in his *Dialogues of the Courtesans* (4). In this production, Melitta, the chief figure in the drama, fears that her lover Charinus will desert her. In a desperate attempt to influence the outcome she solicits the aid of Bacchus who may be able to provide her with a magician who knows the proper spell. Lucian describes the anticipated activities of Bacchus' potential prospect in this fashion, "She picks out a wheel from her bosom and whirls it around, rattling off an incantation full of horrible outlandish names."

I also note in this context the statement by Xenophon of Ephesus (I.5, in his *Τὰ κατὰ Ἀνθίαν καὶ Ἀβροκόμην Ἐφεσιακά*; *The Ephesian story of Anthia and Habrocomes*), who states that after Anthia fell into an incurable depression, her friends Megamedes and Evippe, in an effort to stave off these dark forces:

...fetched soothsayers and holy men [μάγοι καὶ ἱερεῖς]...to find some solution...These busily offered diverse sacrifices...and pronounced certain unintelligible syllables [φωνὰς βαρβαρικὰς] in order to appease, as they said, certain demonic forces.¹¹⁶

To this I also append the beliefs of Iamblichus, who is also of the opinion that foreign names and secret formulas endow the theurgist with the *dynamis* of the gods.¹¹⁷

Within the *PGM* allusions to the primacy and efficacy of *nomina barbara* are numerous. I cite here only one example.¹¹⁸ In *PGM* (VIII.20) an interesting allusion is found to foreign names at the conclusion of the invocation to Hermes, "I know also your foreign names (τὰ βαρβαρικὰ ὀνόματα) Ἰφάρναθαρ βαραχὴλ Χθα. These are your foreign names."

¹¹⁶As quoted in Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 706. The text reads: μάγοι καὶ ἱερεῖς, οἱ δὲ ἐθύοντο καὶ ἐπέσπενδον καὶ ἐπέλεγον φωνὰς βαρβαρικὰς ἐξιλάσκεσθαι λέγοντες δαίμονας καὶ προσεποιοῦν, ὡς εἴη τὸ δεινὸν ἐκ τῶν ὑποχθονίων. Also Heliodorus in his *Aethiopica* 6.14 speaks of ineffable and foreign names being used in an invocation designed to call up a deceased person.

¹¹⁷*De mysteriis* 6.6, 7.5. Paradoxically, however, Iamblichus, at 2.11, defends the gods as having their own intrinsic power which does not need any initiative from a 'subordinate' being to actuate the proper energy. This Janus-faced stance is due to Iamblichus' apologetic intent to defend his conception that the gods have real existence apart from human imagination and belief. For the interested reader I note that another literary example can be found in Hippolytus' *Philosophumena* (otherwise known as the *Refutation of All Heresies*) 4.28.

¹¹⁸Beyond the numerous examples of *nomina barbara* various spells speak of utilizing Hebrew to cast the spell correctly. See III.119-120; IV.3085; V.475, among others.

In light of this evidence it may be fairly said that by the Hellenistic Era the use of foreign (esp. Semitic) names as *instrumentum magicum* appears to be a child of the marriage of the religious worlds of the Orientals and the Greeks.¹¹⁹

This union was made possible by the fact that various Near Eastern languages were thought to be the most ancient, and according to the statements of various authors of antiquity, the original holy languages.¹²⁰ Add to this the well-known Greek preference for ancient religious teachings and one arrives at the theologoumenon that because the gods had revealed their names in this holy language it only stood to reason that the proper relationship between the god and his or her name could only be maintained when the name was utilized in its original language.¹²¹

From this same premise it also followed that unless the name was pronounced in its original language the connection between the god and its name would be broken, and therefore the name would lose its power to compel the god.¹²² The belief that the name, in and of itself, was numinous was bolstered by the further belief that these names were derived from a holy language—even the language of the gods.¹²³ Indeed, insofar as the language itself was holy and the divine name had been delivered in this holy language the name, perforce, was also holy and divine.¹²⁴

¹¹⁹ Pulleyn, "The Power of Names in Classical Greek Religion," *Classical Quarterly* 44 (1994):17-25. Indeed, in certain cases this interface between the two worlds might be best described as a collision which left discernable debris. For example, Bietenhard has noted that the translators of the LXX have consciously emended Lev. 24:16 from the Masoretic reading of, "And whosoever blasphemes the Name of the YHWH shall die the death," to, ὀνομάζων δὲ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θανάτῳ θανατούσθω. In my judgment the change from blasphemy to simply naming (invoking ?) the Name may have been occasioned by the growing concern to address the misuse of the Name in magic. See Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 263.

¹²⁰ As Güntert notes, it may be possible that much of the so-called *nomina barbara* may have been seen as a type of divine language. In any event, Hopfner correctly states concerning the impact that these foreign names had "Auf skeptischer, nüchterner Veranlagte aber mußten diese barbarisch klingenden unverständlichen und ungeheuerlichen Namen und Formeln einen geradezu entgegengesetzten Eindruck machen." For Güntert's views see Güntert, *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister*, 28. For Hopfner see GAOZ § 716.

¹²¹ Hopfner, GAOZ § 718-719.

¹²² Ibid., § 719. Another example can be drawn from the *Corpus Hermeticum* (16.2), where we encounter the claim that unintelligible words which are spoken in Egyptian are imparted with power. I am indebted to R. Gordon's article for this reference. See Richard Gordon, "Imagining Greek and Roman Magic," in *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 243.

¹²³ Ibid. § 718.

¹²⁴ Ibid. § 721.

Indeed, one may wish to follow Proclus here and propose that since the gods were also believed to have come from various geographical areas and knew the indigenous language they were more readily eager to respond to those theurgists who invoked them in their native tongue. And it was naturally believed that the demons understood the words for they hailed from that geographic area, and thus, knew the language.¹²⁵

In this light it is of some interest to note the work of Tambiah,¹²⁶ who has demonstrated that foreign words were absorbed into the fabric of magic of many cultures for the primary reason that it was believed that the demons spoke in these foreign phrases and that it would be inappropriate to communicate with them in one's native tongue.¹²⁷

Finally, the last factor to come into play in forming this belief is that of human psychology. In this case, some listeners believed that they could not understand the name precisely on account of their human frailty. It then followed that the name must be possessed of some extraordinary power which rendered them incapable of apprehending it.¹²⁸

With respect to the point that divine names were divulged through divine revelation, it should be observed that it was a commonplace to view names as acting as revelatory agents of the gods or goddesses, and as such they were capable of revealing the nature, power and rank of the divinity, or so Iamblichus avers, "We possess in those divine names, whose meaning we have obtained, the knowledge of the entire divine nature, power, and rank [of the divinity]."¹²⁹ This

¹²⁵Julian the Apostate also subscribed to this belief. According to *Adv. Galilaeans* (143 A-B) Julian believed that "over each nation is a national god, with an angel acting as its agent, and a demon, and a hero..." This aspect of territoriality of the spirits shall be taken up further in my discussion of the tutelary gods of cities and provinces.

¹²⁶S.J. Tambiah, "The Magical Power of Words," *Man* 3 (1968): 175-208, but compare Campbell Bonner, *Studies in magical amulets chiefly Greco-Roman*, 189.

¹²⁷This view was endorsed by Clement of Alexandria; see *Stromata* 1.143.1, and it is also voiced in *b. Baba Bathra* 134a. For a practical example see *PGM* IV. 605-610 and VII. 562-3. Two further points of interest remain. First, this concept that divine beings have their own language goes back as far as Homer. And secondly, perhaps glossialia, spoken of in the New Testament (I Cor. 13:1), also has some points of contact with this phenomenon (i.e., speaking a heavenly language).

¹²⁸In fairness it should be observed that not all were enamored with the use of numinous names. Porphyry in his *Of the Philosophy to be derived from Oracles* (as quoted in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* 5.10) provides one example, while Eusebius himself was incredulous on their power. See *Praep. evang.*, 4.1.

¹²⁹*Myst.* 7.4.23. The text reads: ἐπὶ τούτων τῆς θείας οὐσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ τάξεως ἔχομεν ὅλης ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τὴν εἰδησιν. See also Proclus *In Cra.* 72.8f.

claim that the name conveys the essence of the gods was also relevant for demons, or so the second century C.E. peripatetic philosopher Aspasius contended:

ὅπερ ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος δηλοῖ ἡ εὐδαιμονία καὶ ἡ κακοδαιμονία περιείληπται γὰρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι ἐκάτερα τῆς μεν τὸ εὖ τῆς δε τὸ κακῶς.¹³⁰

In some sense this perspective is not at all unexpected for, as we have seen, even the names of the gods were at times seen to be in heaven along with the gods, or for that matter the ineffable names of the gods could even fill the whole cosmos as Proclus has Cratylus state:

Τὰ ἄρρητα ὀνόματα τῶν θεῶν πεπλήρωκε τὸν κόσμον. ὥσπερ οἱ θεουργοὶ λέγουσιν. Καὶ οὐ τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν πάσας δυνάμεις...¹³¹

Further aspects of this revelatory belief is seen in the acceptance that invoking the name of the divinity guaranteed its presence in ritual and cultic acts.¹³² In part, such beliefs were predicated on the conception that the names of the gods were ἀγάλματα φωνήεντα-vocal images (cultic?) of the gods.¹³³

Another important aspect of this perception was that the true name of the god could only be received by revelation from the god itself. This theologoumenon follows both directly and simply from the prior belief that since the god possessed a ‘true’ name, a name which by definition only the god itself knew, and only the god, therefore, had the power to disclose the name. Iamblichus enlightens his readers on this point when he writes concerning the *nomina barbara* that:

You ask namely, ‘What really do the meaningless names intend?’ They are not at all meaningless, as you believe...For while it may be that certain of these [names] are for us

¹³⁰In *ethica Nichomachea commentaria*, 29.9. As quoted in Gustavus Heylbut, *Aspasii in ethica Nicomachea quae supersunt commentaria consilio et auctoritate Academiae litterarum regiae borussicae*, *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* 19.1, (Berlin: Reimer, 1889).

¹³¹From *ad Alcibiades* 150. As quoted in Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 687. Translated: “The secret names of the gods have filled the whole world, as the theurgist say, and not only this world, but also all the powers above it.”

¹³²As Heitmüller correctly comments, “Die Kenntnis des N.ens [Names] der Gottheit ist Voraussetzung für den Kultus.” See Heitmüller, “Namenglauben,” 662.

¹³³So Democritus, Fr. 142 [Diels⁵, I, 170, 9]. As quoted in Bietenhard, “ὄνομα,” 249. It should be noted that Bietenhard prefers the translation of “speaking statues.” Interesting Von Rad, when discussing the name of YHWH states that “er [the name of God] nimmt theologische die Stelle ein, an der sich in anderen Kulturen das Kultusbild befindet.” See Gerhard Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments. Band I. Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels* (Münich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962), 196.

humans non-understandable....others however are for us understandable, whose interpretation (and significance) we have received from the gods themselves...¹³⁴

Likewise Proclus also asserts that mankind had, through the gods themselves, received the secret names of the gods as he states in his *In Cra.* 72:8, 122 and *In Ti.* III 32:18. And moreover he states that these secret names served as a *symbolon* for the divinity itself (*In Cra.* 31:4, 25; *In Ti.* 1.211, 1). Proclus states that:

καὶ θεῶν ἐστὶν ὀνόματα παραδεδομένα παρὰ τοῖς θεολόγοις, οἷς οἱ θεοὶ τὰ πράγματα καλοῦσιν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ δαιμόνων μόνον· τὰ γὰρ δρώμενα ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις εἰς αὐτούς ἐστὶν τοὺς θεούς ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς τοὺς ἐξηρητημένους αὐτῶν δαίμονας.

It is clear that examples of this belief abound in the *PGM* as well as virtually all other magical texts from the era of my concern as close inspection of these texts demonstrates. I cite here several texts in support of this conclusion.

For example, the devotee responsible for *PGM* II. 125-130 (cf. *PGM* I.160; *PGM* XII.92-95; *PGM* XIII.210-211) introduces himself to the god with the following claim, “I am he, NN, who have presented myself to you, and you have given me as a gift the knowledge of your most great name...” In *PGM* III.155-160 the theurgist introduces himself to the divinity in a similar fashion and states, “I am he whom you met and [to whom] you granted knowledge and holy utterance of your greatest name, by which you control the whole inhabited world...”

These texts witness to the fact that the impartation of the ‘true’ name of the god was attributable to nothing other than divine revelation.

As an aside, it is not without interest to note that this sort of revelatory act extended even to the impartation of rites and incantations as *PGM* III.438-442 shows (cf. Proclus’ statement in *In Cra.* 122). In this text the adept imputes to one Manethon (presumably the one and same Egyptian priest who was instrumental in the founding of the cult of Sarapis) the receiving of the magical procedure discussed in the text as a gift from the god. He states that, “A procedure greater than this one does not exist. It has been tested by Manethon, [who] received [it] as a gift from the god Osiris...”

Another area of import to my analysis is the various cultic expressions and acts that we find directed toward numinous divine names. For example, according to *PGM* I.206 the divine name is said to have been “consecrated by all the angels.” In *PGM* III.591-595 the devotee offers

¹³⁴ *Myst.* 7.4-5.

this paean, “We give you thanks with every soul and heart stretched out to [you], unutterable name honoured with [the] appellation god...” Other expressions bound up with divine names are found in *PGM* XII.256, where the divine numinous name is said to be “hymned” by the angels (cf. XIII.636-637). In *PGM* XIII.788-789 and XXI. 15-16 the Muses are said to sing out and praise the glorious name. To this it may be added that numinous divine names are said to be glorified in *PGM* XXXVI.166, as well as blessed in *PGM* XLVIII.12-13.

With regard to the import of knowing the ‘true’ name in invoking the gods it is worthy of note that this belief is intimated at least as far back as the time of Plato, where in his *Cratylus* (71), we find the claim that the names of the gods were secret.¹³⁵

Later witnesses, such as Lucan (first century C.E.), also shed some illumination on this belief. In his epic work on the Roman civil war (the sixth book of *De bello civili* 6.438-830, otherwise known as the *Pharsalia*) he relates how Sextus Pompeius consulted a Thessalian witch named Erichtho in order to perform an incantation for him to carry out a necromantic procedure. At stake was the foreknowledge of the outcome of the battle of Pharsalia. At first she invokes Eumenides, and thereafter, chthonic deities such as Persephone. But most interestingly after what appeared to be a dilatory response she threatens to summon the Furies by their “real names.”

Further exposition on this matter can be found in Lactantius, who points out that reference to the ‘true’ names of the gods can be multiplied many times when magical texts are consulted. Lactantius maintains that:

But the magicians, and those whom the people truly call enchanter, when they practice their detestable arts, call upon them (i.e., the spirits) by their true names, those heavenly names which are read in the sacred writings.¹³⁶

This concept naturally also extended to tutelary deities. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this belief is seen in the fact that the names of the tutelary deities merited classification as military weapons worthy of being kept secret from any enemy. While the practice appears to

¹³⁵ This claim of course implies that a petitioner must find out this secret name in order to invoke the divinity.

¹³⁶ *Divinae institutiones* 2.17. Along these lines see for example *PGM* IV.280; VIII.42-45; IX.14; XXXIIa.25; *PDM* xii.115,121-122; and xiv.218 to cite but a few.

date back to the Babylonian and Assyrians,¹³⁷ my interest lies in its practice as evidenced in the Greco-Roman world. For example, Servius (Marius), in his commentary on Virgil, informs us that the true name of the god who guarded the city of Rome was kept secret in order to prohibit the intervention of any antagonist against Rome through *evocatio* of the patron deity of the city.¹³⁸

Pliny also affirms this use of the power of the true name when used in *evocatio* against an enemy city:

Verrius Flaccus cites trustworthy authorities to show that it was the custom, at the very beginning of a siege, for the Roman priests to call forth the divinity under whose protection the besieged town was....Down to the present day this ritual has remained part of the doctrine of the Pontiffs, and it is certain that the reason why the [authentic name of] the tutelary deity of Rome has been kept secret is to prevent any enemy from acting in a similar way. There is indeed nobody who does not fear to be spellbound by imprecations.¹³⁹

Further Pliny also relates a story about Valerius Soranus who was purportedly crucified for disclosing the secret name of the Roman *Schutzgöttes*.¹⁴⁰ That the Roman estimation of the value of true and numinous names of the tutelary gods gained currency in the Greek world is vouchsafed by this comment from Plutarch, in a narrative dependant upon Pliny's report. The narrative states:

¹³⁷So Fossey, *Magie*, 58, 95-96. As quoted in Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 697. In addition, Clodd mentions that Alexander the Great received in a dream the name of the tutelary deity who protected Tyre. See Edward Clodd, *Magic in Names and Other Things* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1920), 135.

¹³⁸See *Aeneid* 2.351. Cf. 12.841. The Oxford Classical Dictionary cites Livy 5.21ff (cf. Varro's *Antiquitates divinae* 14) as perhaps the earliest example of an *evocatio*. According to Livy, Juno Regina was drawn out of the Etruscan city of Veii in 396 B.C.E. For further details see *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* 3rd ed., eds. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 580.

¹³⁹*HN* 28.4.18-9.

¹⁴⁰*Ibid.*, 3, 65, "...and besides all these Rome itself, whose other name [its secret 'true' name] it is held to be a sin to utter except at the ceremonies of the mysteries, and when Valerius Soranus divulged the secret religiously kept for the general protection and well being of the state, he soon paid the penalty. It seems pertinent to add at this point an instance of old religion established especially to inculcate this silence; the goddess Angerona, [who] is represented in her statue with a sealed bandage over her mouth." For further information see Angelo Brelich, *Die Geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom* (Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1949) and V. Basanoff, *EVOCATIO: Étude d'un Rituel Militaire Romain* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1947). For the interested reader it should be noted that Brelich occupies himself with particular cults and divinities which were involved in this concept and other related issues. Regrettably he does not take up the theme of numinous names in Greco-Roman religion, or the function and role of *evocatio* in cultic rituals. For this one must turn to Basanoff whose work is profitable in this respect.

Why is it forbidden to mention or to inquire after or to call by name that deity, whether it be male or female, whose especial province is to protect and watch over Rome? This prohibition....they connect with Valerius Soranus [who] came to an evil end because he revealed the name. It is because, as certain Roman writers have recorded, there are certain evocations and enchantments affecting the gods, by which the Romans also believed that certain gods had been called forth from their enemies...and that they were afraid of having the same thing done to them.¹⁴¹

Similarly, Macrobius, drawing upon a report from Sammonicus Serenus, states Furias possessed “a song, by means of which the gods are called out, when the city is surrounded.” Furias, it was said, reserved this song for the last siege of Carthage.¹⁴² Further on in his narrative, Macrobius, taking as his point of departure the line from Virgil’s *Aeneid* (2.351), which reads “Gone forth are all the gods by whose aid this realm once stood,” then goes on to explain the origin and custom of the Romans that the name of the *Schutzgöttes* was to be enveloped in the utmost secrecy. He says:

The reference here is to a Roman custom of the greatest antiquity and to rites of the greatest secrecy. For it is well known that every city is under the protection of some deity, and it is an established fact that it was the custom of the Romans (a secret custom and one unknown to many) by means of a prescribed formula [by invoking a name] to call forth the tutelary deities of an enemy city which they were besieging...*That is why the Romans, for their part, were careful to see to it that the tutelary god of the city of Rome [i.e., its name] and the Latin name of the city should not be known.* [emphasis mine]...But even the most learned of men do not know the name of the city, for the Romans took care that an enemy should not do to them what, as they well knew, they had often done to enemy cities and call forth the divine protector of Rome, *if the [true] name was revealed (si tutelae suae nomen divulgaretur).* [emphasis mine].¹⁴³

Not without further interest is the claim made by both Lydus,¹⁴⁴ and Macrobius,¹⁴⁵ that the city of Rome had three names. Following Lydus we find that one name was secret (τελεστικόν), the second a holy name (ἱερατικὸν ὄνομα), and the third a political name (πολιτικὸν ὄνομα). According to Lydus Rome’s secret name was Ἐρως, which as Hopfner

¹⁴¹ *Moralia, Quaestiones Romanae* 278-9.

¹⁴² See *Saturnalia* 3. 9.2-9. As quoted in Hopfner, “Mageia,” 337. Idem. *GAOZ* § 696. Original text reads, “*carmen, quo di evocantur, cum appugnatione civitas cingitur.*”

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁴ *De mensibus* 4.73.

¹⁴⁵ *Sat.* 3.9.2/9.

has observed is the same as the Latin word for love (i.e., amor), which when spelled backwards produces Roma.¹⁴⁶ As for Macrobius he claims that various experts in Roman history were in disagreement over what the name of the tutelary divinity was but he notes that they generally adhered to the following conjectures: Jupiter, Luna, Angerona or Ops Consivia (the god of sowing, lit. personified Abundance).

Macrobius also states that there were in effect two formulae, one formula (a *carmen*) was for calling out the tutelary deity, the other formula was devoted to ensuring the destruction of the enemy troops. For this latter formula Macrobius cites the Fifth Book of Sammonicus Serenus' *Res reconditae* and cites the author to the effect that (9-10):

Cities and armies, on the other hand, are thus devoted to destruction after the protecting deities have been called forth [*evocatis*], but only rulers [*dictatores*] and supreme commanders have the power to use the formula.

This belief was in part sparked into life by the further belief that cities were believed to be situated within a magical radius (the *pomerium*, a wall which delimited an augurally constituted city), where so to speak, the power of the *Schützgottes* was operative.¹⁴⁷

Naturally this fear of public disclosure meant that these secret names were to be kept secure in various sacred writings which were kept away from curious eyes.¹⁴⁸ In fact, such conceptions led the Romans to create an *indigitamenta*, i.e. lit. 'invoked deities,' a list of divine names used to call down specific gods on specific occasions.¹⁴⁹

It is of further interest to note a related aspect, viz., that the priest of Jupiter was forbidden to speak out any names of any articles associated with the underworld (which presumably stood in some sort of relationship with the chthonic deities).¹⁵⁰ On a different tack,

¹⁴⁶See *GAOZ* § 697-698.

¹⁴⁷See Kurt Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlag, 1966), 41. As we shall encounter later on, there are numerous passages in the Old Testament which declare that YHWH resided within the city of Jerusalem. It may be that the origin of this sort of claim resides in a similar tutelary-deity belief as we find in Greco-Roman speculation.

¹⁴⁸Lactantius, *Div. inst.* 2.16.

¹⁴⁹Pulleyn, "The Power of Names in Classical Greek Religion," 19. Indeed, as Latte correctly notes the very word *indigitare* means to call out the names of the gods. See *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, 43. For the interested reader consult Varro, who offers in his *Antiquitates divinae* (14) an example of *indigitamenta*.

¹⁵⁰Plutarch *Quaest. Rom.* 109 ff.

Cicero states that no masculine being could be allowed to hear the true name of the good god (*Bona Dea*).¹⁵¹

In point of fact, even knowledge of the true name of the highest god (*maximi Dei*) could bring death. Lactantius Placidus mentions an Etruscan who once evoked a Nymph in order to ascertain the true name of the god and when he thereafter whispered its 'true' name into the ear of one of his contemporaries he immediately expired.¹⁵² He also relates a story where it is claimed an ox died when it heard the ineffable name of God.¹⁵³ Another example can be found in *PGM* IV.607-610, where the following invocation is found, "I invoke the immortal names, living and honored, which never pass into mortal nature and are not declared in articulate speech by human tongue..."

These parallels invite comparison with the numerous stories of a similar nature concerning the name of YHWH which we will encounter in the next section on the Semitic name-concept. Although it takes me out of the realm of Greco-Roman magic it is worth observing that in Egypt the secret names of the gods held such power that even their fellow divine beings were occupied in attempting to find out the 'true' names of other divinities.¹⁵⁴

In light of the data delivered by these authors concerning the Roman *Schutzgöttes* Hopfner's appreciation of this aspect of Greco-Roman name-mysticism deserves to be noted here. Hopfner states, "Ein solches Name von göttlicher Natur und Kraft, der mit seinem Träger eins ist, ist natürlich geheim und muss auch geheimgehalten werden."¹⁵⁵

With Hopfner's assessment in mind I shall now turn to non-literary texts such as *PGM* VII. 1022, where the petitioner is expected to be granted victory because he knows the 'true' names of the divinity. That an accurate knowledge of the 'authentic' name was important may also be adduced from *PGM* I.36 where the *πάρεδρος* (i.e., the supernatural assistant of the

¹⁵¹Cicero, *De haruspicum responso* 37. As quoted in Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 45 fn. 3.

¹⁵²Placid. *Ad Statius Thebais* 4.516.

¹⁵³For further details see Stern, *Greek and Roman Authors*, 683 n. 7.

¹⁵⁴ Isis was involved in just such a mission according to an Egyptian legend. For further details see László Kákósy, *Zauberei im alten Ägypten*, 118. See also Appendix Five.

¹⁵⁵Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 695.

supplicant, basically a demon or spirit helper) is invoked by recourse to its “authentic name (αὐθεν[τικόν] σου ὄνομα).”¹⁵⁶

In an interesting *charitesion* (a charm designed to gain favor) from the early third century C.E. the petitioner states, “If on account of you all beings fear your great name, your great might, give me the good things...If your hidden name has granted favor....give me victory, repute, beauty before all men and before all women.”¹⁵⁷ Texts such as these could lead Heitmüller to state concerning the ‘true’ names of the gods that “...so ist die Kenntnis der wahren N.n [Name’s] der Gottheit die Grundlage der „Gnosis“, der Gnosis im höheren Sinn als der Erkenntnis des Wesens Gottes.”¹⁵⁸

Another aspect of name-mysticism was that the names of the gods, as well as demons, were envisioned as being apotropaic. Whether or not this belief originally coalesced around numinous names is uncertain. Plutarch’s comments on the apotropaic use of the Ephesia Grammata¹⁵⁹ may indicate that this theologoumenon was first applied to the Ephesia Grammata and perhaps only at a later date applied to numinous names (i.e., by perhaps the Second or First Century B.C.E.).¹⁶⁰ Of course direct borrowing from Oriental religious practice also remains tenable. In any event, given what appears to us today as an inordinate emphasis upon demons

¹⁵⁶ Other examples of the importance of the true or secret name are given in *PGM* III. 394-405; *PGM* XXIIb.20; LXXX.3; XCII. 10; *PDM* xiv.218; *Suppl.* 45-6.

¹⁵⁷ As quoted in *Supplementum Magicum* # 63 eds. Robert Daniel and Franco Maltomini, (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1992), 62.

¹⁵⁸ Heitmüller, “Namenglauben im NT,” 662-3.

¹⁵⁹ *Quaestiones convivales* 7.5.4 (760e). Plutarch remarks: ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ μάγοι τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους κελεύουσι τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλέγειν καὶ ὀνομάζειν. Additionally, Ogdon reviews the oft-cited fragment from Menander which states that the *Ephesia Grammata* were used to ward off evil from newly married couples. He also mentions a Cretan amulet from the fourth century B.C.E. which has the *Ephesia Grammata* inscribed upon it. For further details see Daniel Ogden, “Binding Spells: Curse Tablets and Voodoo Dolls in the Greek and Roman Worlds,” in *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*, eds. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 47, 51.

¹⁶⁰ Of course the *Ephesia Grammata* may have come to be invoked in apotropaic incantations precisely because its foreign sounding words appear to be *nomina barbara*. Whatever the case may be, the significance and power of the *Ephesia Grammata* can be seen in that Pausanias claimed that Artemis had the six terms inscribed on various parts of her body. The passage, which comes from Eustathius’ *Od.* T 247, runs as follows: ἀσαφῶς καὶ αἰνιγματωδῶς ἐπὶ ποδῶν καὶ ζώνης καὶ στεφάνης ἐπιγέγραπται τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τὰ τοιαῦτα γράμματα. As quoted in Brashear, “The Greek Magical Papyri,” 3429-3430.

and the like it may prove useful to quickly review the place which demons played in everyday life.

One of the most significant roles which demons played was that they stood between mankind and the gods and served to reveal the divine realm to mankind. This relationship between humans and the divine followed in part both by how the Greco-Roman world viewed the nature of these beings, but also because demons were believed to fill the entire universe.¹⁶¹ Another significant role which demons played was that they were believed to have advanced knowledge of future events and could convey this knowledge to the theurgist.¹⁶²

Furthermore, it was believed that demons could communicate with humans through dreams and oracles, as well as deliver to mankind the knowledge of various medicinal agents derived from animal and plant sources.¹⁶³ Even more important was the belief that demons enabled the magical arts-activators of magical powers as it were. One early witness to this belief is found in Plato's *Symposium* 202 D 13, where Plato states that demons stand in an intermediary role between the gods and mankind (καὶ γὰρ πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξύ ἐστὶν θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ). Plato maintains that demons interpret and translate matters between mankind and the gods (ἐρμηνεύον καὶ διαπορθμεύον θεοῖς τὰ παρ' ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν) and that this indispensable role allows for the various divinatory arts to operate (διὰ τούτου καὶ ἡ μαντική πᾶσα χωρεῖ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἱερέων τέχνη τῶν τε περὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τελετὰς καὶ τὰς ἐπωδὰς καὶ τὴν μαντείαν πᾶσαν καὶ γοητείαν.)¹⁶⁴ A final, but no less interesting aspect of the power of demons, was that some people were disposed to believe that demons caused illness and disease, even in animals.¹⁶⁵ Alexander Polyhistor, in his *ap. Diog. Laert.* 8.32, quotes from the *Pythagorean Commentaries* to the effect that:

¹⁶¹So *Diog. Laert.* 1.1.27.

¹⁶²I draw here upon the list generated by Hopfner in his helpful review of this aspect of Greco-Roman beliefs. As for the appropriate authors see Plato *Symp.* 202d; Aristotle's *Div. somn.* 2; Apuleius *De deo Soc.* 43; Ammian 21.1; Tertullian *De anim.* 351D; *Apol.* 23.32; Clemens Alexandrinus (Clement) *Stromata* 1.2.135; Iamblichus *Myst.* 3.18,31, 4.7; Proclus *In R.* 1.41,19; Lactantius *Div. inst.* 2.14; Psellus *De operat. daem.* 24.1.83,7; Minucius Felix *Oct.* 27. This list derives from Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 4.

¹⁶³*Diog. Laert.* 7.32. See also Cicero *Div.* 1.3, 2.58.

¹⁶⁴Quote taken from Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 20.

¹⁶⁵A belief no less attested in Greek circles than in Jewish. See Bent Noack, *Satanás und Sotería, Untersuchungen zur Neutestamentlichen Dämonologie*, (København: G.E.C. Gads Forlag, 1948), 66-67.

The whole air is full of souls. We call them *daemons* and heroes, and it is they that send dreams, signs and illnesses to men; and not only to men, but also to sheep and other domestic animals. It is towards those *daemons* that we direct purifications and apotropaic rites, all kinds of divination, the art of reading chance utterances, and so on.¹⁶⁶

Part and parcel of this belief was the notion that demons (and their names) had apotropaic powers. Lucian delivers an interesting narrative that pertains to this theme. In his *Philopseudes* (17) we read of one Eucrates, who is an advocate for magic practices, and who interjects in his argument that unlike some he has no fear of the spirits for, at least in part, he knows the proper apotropaic names:

At first I was disturbed by them [i.e., seeing the spirits], but now of course, because of their familiarity and especially since the Arab gave me the ring made of iron from crosses and taught me the spell of many names [I no longer fear them].

Part of this belief in the apotropaic power of divine names was the notion that such names were capable of keeping hostile spiritual forces at bay. Two texts which echo this belief are *PGM* XIII.761-66, and XXI.1-29 (cf. *PGM* XIII.795), where we read:

Come to me, you from the four winds, ruler of all, who breathed spirit into men for life, whose is the hidden and unspeakable name-it cannot be uttered by human mouth-at whose name even the demons, when hearing, are terrified...

And;

[Hear me lord, whose secret name is unspeakable], at whose [name, when] the demons [hear it, even they are terrified...]...[And] you [lord of life, ruling] the upper and lower regions....whose glorious [name] the Muses praise...no spirit, no visitation, no demon, no evil being will oppose me, for I have your name as a single phylactery [in my heart]...

Similar views are also recorded in a summons of Isis (*PGM* VII. 496-500, ca. third century C.E.; cf. *PGM* V.42-47), where the supplicant prays:

Protect me, great and marvelous names of the [gods]...Protect me, great and marvelous names of the great god [διαφυλάξατέ με, τὰ μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστά ὀνόματα]...., glorify me, as I have glorified the name [ἐδόξασα τὸ ὄνομα] of your son Horus...

Another apotropaic role was the use of divine names in exorcisms. This role came to play a cardinal role in both Jewish and Christian thinking, as I shall demonstrate in the section which treats the Jewish and Christian materials. Suffice it to say that numinous names came to be thought of as the chief instrument in affecting the expulsion of a demon.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁶ As cited by Gordon. See Richard Gordon, "Imagining Greek and Roman Magic," 226.

¹⁶⁷ Heitmüller, "Namenglauben im NT," 663.

Another aspect that I mentioned in my enumeration of magical praxis was that some magicians believed that *sympatheia* with the gods could be obtained by virtue of their magical machinations. Unlike the amateur who followed simplistic magical practices these adepts believed they possessed a more sophisticated and nuanced means of promoting a relationship between themselves and the gods. They believed that the gods listened to their petition because they were skilled magicians who could adroitly handle magical names, sigla, instruments, and in many cases the application of *historiolae* (i.e. a narrative concerning some significant aspect of the deeds of the deity).¹⁶⁸ One interesting example drawn from literary texts is that of Iamblichus. He registers his view that the various names and formulas must be recited perfectly (thus necessitating an experienced votary), lest an inferior being, or worse yet a menacing one, appear in the guise of the god whom the theurgist was attempting to invoke.¹⁶⁹

Another example of this viewpoint, as witnessed to in non-literary texts, is found in *PGM* XIII. 55-58, where the magician instructs his acolyte, “For without these [proper rituals and formula] the god will not listen, but, thinking you uninitiated [ὥς ἀμυστηρίαστον], will refuse to receive [you]...”. This same line of thought is seen in *PGM* III.496-501 and III.622-627 where we read:

Hear me in every ritual which [I perform], and grant all the [petitions] of my prayer completely, because I know your signs, [symbols and] forms, who you are at each hour and what your name is.

And,

Cause now my shadow to serve me, because I know your sacred names [and] your signs and your symbols and [who you are at each hour], and what your name is.

Although the claims posted in these texts appear relatively infrequently, it is nevertheless illustrative of how the knowledge of the proper names and siglas became so complex and baffling that some believed that the gods would only listen to those who could aptly carry out these rites with proper circumspection and order.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸Hopfner, “Mageia,” 343. Other types of *historiolae*, such as short stories designed to sympathetically induce an illness to cease its effects, are not of relevance here.

¹⁶⁹*Myst.* 2.10 and 3.31.

¹⁷⁰Cf. *PGM* VII.786.

Now the *PGM* was primarily composed by highly sophisticated magicians, and this perhaps signals that many magicians underwent a period of study which demonstrates the necessity for properly knowing the true names and sigla of the gods. Finally, the importance in correctly performing the rites was not to be ignored. Indeed, the consequences of an ill-conceived recitation could even be dangerous as Hopfner observes:

Selbstverständlich müssen diese ὀνόματα und λόγοι *peinlich genau nach Vorschrift* [Hopfner's emphasis] recitiert werden; geschieht das nicht, so kann das für den Beschwörenden *von sehr üblen Folgen* [Hopfner's emphasis] begleitet sein.¹⁷¹

The eleventh prominent characteristic of Hellenistic magic in my survey is the use of onomatomantism (i.e., gematria, or the use of numerology to 'divine' the gods or spirits), a practice first attested to in Babylonian sources.¹⁷² In order to ascertain the true import of the use of gematria I shall review Greco-Roman examples which will underscore the major themes in this practice. I shall first examine the evidence from various Greek corpora.

From the start it should be noted that number symbolism was originally quarried from a particular vein of Greek philosophical speculation, and onomatomantism was to become a particularly vigorous component of Pythagorean philosophy.¹⁷³ As Lucian, in his scandalous parody of philosophical charlatans,¹⁷⁴ remarks concerning the Pythagorean *Zahlenwert*, "God is number and mind and harmony." In the course of time this belief that the divine could be encapsulated into numbers was to become an important aspect of the philosophical rumblings of significant members of the later Neo-Pythagorean school (e.g., Nicomachus' *θεολογούμενα ἀριθμητικῆς*). That Pythagorean onomatomantic belief was important in magic is seen not only in the examples found in the *PGM*, of which I shall say more shortly, but also in literary sources such as Hippolytus, who states that "And he [Pythagoras] also touched on magic-as they say-and himself discovered an art of physiognomy laying down as a basis certain numbers and measures, saying that they comprised the principle of arithmetic philosophy..."¹⁷⁵ That such beliefs were

¹⁷¹ As quoted in Hopfner, *GAOZ*, § 781.

¹⁷² From approximately 800 B.C.E., or so. See Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, 156.

¹⁷³ Although the practice is first attested to in Greek witnesses by Berossos. See Dornseiff, *Ibid.*, 95, 156.

¹⁷⁴ *ΒΙΩΝ ΠΙΠΑΣΙΣ* or *Philosophies for Sale*, 4.

¹⁷⁵ *Haer.* 1.2.

commonplace in Greco-Roman times is also seen in the comment found in Pseudo-Cyprian, where the author reports concerning the importance of this practice in the magical technique of the Egyptian magician named Bolus¹⁷⁶ that, καὶ ἐμαθον βολᾶς λόγων καὶ ἀριθμῶν εἰς λόγους καὶ λόγων εἰς ἀριθμῶν.¹⁷⁷

Examples of the application of onomatomantism further reveals that the *Zahlenwort* could be viewed as a conduit for the flow of power. For example, the tradent responsible for *PGM* IV.935 (ca. second century C.E.) instructs his mente, “hold fast a pebble (ψῆφος) numbered 3663 on your breast and invoke the god as follows...” The adept then transcribes the name from the mystical palindrome $1+10+50+600+800+800+800+600=3663$.¹⁷⁸

Similarly, in *PGM* VIII. 40-50 we read:

Your true name [τό δὲ ἀληθινὸν ὄνομα σου] has been inscribed on the sacred stele in the shrine at Hermopolis where your birth is. Your true name: OSERGARIACH NOMAPHI. This is your name with fifteen letters, but the second name has a number seven, corresponding to those who rule the world,¹⁷⁹ with the exact number 365 days, corresponding to the days of the year.

Here, the cipher was symbolic of the days of the year in which his god reigned (a *Tagesgötter*).

In *PGM* II. 129 the supplicant has been empowered because “...you have given me as a gift the knowledge of your most great name, of which the number is 9,999.”¹⁸⁰ Here the number 9,999 represents the sum of the entire Greek alphabet where each letter has been summed to the next in the series, and thus the number symbolized infinity.¹⁸¹

These examples can be augmented by also mentioning *PGM* IV.1980, where the petitioner states that his invocation should be heeded because:

¹⁷⁶ Bolus was a third century B.C.E. Egyptian author who wrote on magic.

¹⁷⁷ As cited in Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 705.

¹⁷⁸ According to Dornseiff's calculations, in his *Das Alphabet*, 184, the number 3663 refers to BAINCHÔÔÔCH which is one of the names of the god referred to in verse 973. The word is Egyptian in origin and means “spirit of darkness.”

¹⁷⁹ This corresponds with the prevalent ancient conception that there were seven spheres in the cosmos which were ruled by seven archons.

¹⁸⁰ Other examples from the *PGM* are XIII. 156-7 and XIII. 467-8.

¹⁸¹ So Bonner, *Magical Amulets*, 141-2. See also Reinhold Merkelbach and Maria Totti, *Abrasax: ausgewählte papiri religiösen und magischen inhalts Band I* (Obladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1990), 21. This notion is the same as the Α-Ω imagery which is used of Jesus and God in Biblical tradition.



I call upon your four-part name CHTHETHÔ NI LAILAM ΙΑΘ ΖΟΥCHE ΠΙΠΤΟË. I call upon your name Horus which is in number equal to the names of the Moirai [i.e., the Fates].¹⁸²

From these examples it can be seen that a number could reveal the nature and function of the god.¹⁸³

Of further interest to my survey is the fact that this usage extended even to the Tetragrammaton. In the spell from Hadrumentum (ca. third century C.E.),¹⁸⁴ which I have already referred to, the author in his reticence to pronounce the Divine Name states, ὀρκίζω σε τὸ ἅγιον ὄνομα ὃ οὐ λέγεται· ἐν τῷ ἰσαρίθμῳ ὀνομάσω αὐτό.¹⁸⁵

In most cases the number clearly functioned as a cipher which reveals the nature and function of the divinity, although in other cases the number was believed to have power in and of itself. An example of this latter belief is found in the narrative of Alexander of Tralles, who mentions a ψῆφος (a pebble inscribed with numbers) which a Cretan held in his hand and then held against his nostrils in order to cure his hiccups.¹⁸⁶

Finally I should mention the interesting discussion found in *PGM* LXII 47-51, where a die was used to determine the future fate of a person. Here the name of the god was to be inscribed on a die with its numerical equivalent, as the text amply demonstrates:

Make the inquirer throw this die in the bowl. Let him fill this with water. Add to the [cast of the die] 612, which is [the numerical value] the name of god, i.e., 'Zeus,' and subtract from the sum 353 which is [the numerical value] of 'Hermes.'

All of these examples demonstrate that it came quite natural to a magician/theurgist to convert a divine name into its numerical equivalent. And of course it was the divine name which bestowed numinous properties upon the number rather than the number itself.

¹⁸²This same equation of the Moirai, their names, and numerical equivalency with Horus is also repeated in *PGM* IV.455. The Moirai were classic chthonic Attic gods otherwise known as the Fates. Thus, the syncretistic impulse to merge Horus with the Moirai is prompted, albeit with a twist, because they were synonymous by virtue of the numerical equivalence of their names (i.e., isophrenism).

¹⁸³Merkelbach, *Abrasax*, 21

¹⁸⁴Once again see Gagner, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells*, 112.

¹⁸⁵Ibid. See footnote on page 49 for an explanation concerning the use here of the Tetragrammaton. In any event Wunsch was unable to ascertain what number was used to represent the Tetragrammaton. See "Antike Fluchtafeln," 23, footnote to line 20.

¹⁸⁶As quoted in Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 705. See also Hippolytus' *Haer.* 4.44 for a further example.

Another salient characteristic of Hellenistic name-mysticism is that it was perceived that names associated with the most high or potent gods, in particular Jewish divine beings or principal agents (i.e., intermediaries such as angels, apotheosized patriarchal figures, and even Scriptural texts) were the most effectual tools in commandeering, or alternatively prohibiting, demonic influence over someone.¹⁸⁷

In this connection it is of some interest to note that many aspects of Greco-Roman magic stemmed, in part, from Semitic and Egyptian sources. Certainly the Romans believed that the Jews had their own branch of magic which had seeped into their culture.¹⁸⁸ Furthermore, the Egyptians had the advantage in Greco-Roman eyes of being able to claim that they had received the most ancient and venerable tales,¹⁸⁹ as well as the original names of the gods.¹⁹⁰

The charge that Eastern and Semitic religious conceptions had pollinated Greco-Roman religious beliefs finds further corroboration in the fact that Classical Greece provided an intellectual soil that proved to be nonconducive for the growth of the name-magic that we witness in the Hellenistic Era.¹⁹¹

This leads one to conclude that magic as practiced in Hellenistic times did not come to the fore until after the Alexandrian conquest of the Levant, with a concomitant influx of Semitic theological and magical beliefs.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁷Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: A study of the relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 346. Campbell Bonner, noted for his cautious stance, also observes that there were precious few Greek magical texts from late antiquity that were without some integral Jewish component. See Bonner, *Magical Amulets*, 28.

¹⁸⁸To cite but one example, Pliny in his *Naturalis Historia* 30.2.11 states, "There is yet another branch of magic, derived from Moses, Jannes, Lotapes and the Jews..."

¹⁸⁹As noted in Jacques Schwartz, "Papyri Magicae Graecae und Magische Gemmen," in *Die Orientalischen Religionen im Römerreich*, ed. Maarten J. Vermaseren, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981), 499.

¹⁹⁰Among the many indications of this respect, I cite only one: the claim that Jesus derived his power from the names of powerful angels, a knowledge which he learned in Egypt (Arnobius *adversus Gentes* 1.43).

¹⁹¹As Wachsmuth has correctly observed, "The conception of a power which is capable of influencing the course of nature, and by which men may even compel the [Homeric] gods is un-Grecian." As quoted in Joyce Egerton Lowe, *Magic in Greek and Latin Literature*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1929), 11. Perhaps it was an oversight but Lowe does not cite where she obtained this quotation. In any case, it should be said that Wachsmuth is not claiming that magical practices were not employed in Classical times, but rather that it was an alien concept to think that some medium, such as names, could force the classical Homeric pantheon of gods into subservience.

¹⁹²Part of this trajectory can be witnessed in the gradual displacement of the classic chthonic gods of Greece with the aerial spirits and gods of the Semites. The original Greek emphasis upon the chthonic deities may be seen in the fact that in all early Greek *κατάδεσμοι* the deities invoked (in order) were Hermes, Ge, Hecate, and

As noted earlier magic and supernatural manifestations were unquestionably constituent elements of the public domain, and in this arena no one ethnic group occupied more ground than the Jews. No doubt this helps to explain the fact that the Greek name for YHWH (i.e., Iao) is the most administered name in magical papyri from the Hellenistic era.¹⁹³ It also helps to explain the fact, in a practice which invites comparison with the occasional use of Homeric verse to enhance magical efficacy,¹⁹⁴ that 38 Christian texts are either utilized or cited within the *PGM*, among other scriptural citations, as a source of power.¹⁹⁵ Of further relevance in this connection is that the only historical persons invoked in the papyri are Jewish or Christian.¹⁹⁶

Moreover, as A.D. Nock pointed out, it was the inordinate thirst for supernatural power, rather than dogma or divine personality, which helped create this favorable climate towards syncretism in Imperial times.¹⁹⁷ This willingness to incorporate the views of different religions and mystical beliefs helped to secure a firm place for Jewish beliefs concerning angels, demons, and other aspects of the hylic realm within the magical world view of the Greco-Roman practitioners of the various magical arts.

Persephone-all chthonic deities. Certainly other phenomena attended this transition. Some of which were an increase in *nomina barbara*, an increased international flavor, longer and more protracted spells with an ever increasing list of *voces magicae* and symbols. Most of these changes flourished at the beginning of the Imperial era. See Gagner, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells*, 5, 6, 12; Daniel Ogden, "Binding Spells: Curse Tablets and Voodoo Dolls in the Greek and Roman Worlds," 46, 48 and G.H.R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, V. 1, (Marrickville: Macquarie University, 1984), 35. With respect to the invocation of chthonic deities in *defixiones* from the Classical period see Christopher A. Faraone, "The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells," in *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic & Religion*, eds. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 6.

¹⁹³ As Brashear notes, Jewish elements in general dominate the *PGM*. See William Brashear, "The Greek Magical Papyri," 3427.

¹⁹⁴ Indeed, in some circles of Greco-Roman society, Hermes himself was thought to work miracles utilizing Homeric verse. As quoted in Schwartz, "Papyri Magica Graecae und Magische Gemmen," 489.

¹⁹⁵ So E.A. Judge, "The Magical use of Scripture in the Papyri," in *Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of Francis I. Andersen's Sixtieth Birthday*, eds. Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing, (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 346. Of the 38, 15 draw consciously from Scriptural texts. Judge also mentions the interesting fact that in all of Antiquity only the Old Testament was "...systematically propagated across the whole of the social ranking system." This may help to explain how Old Testament citations crept into magical argot as even common Jewish people were well-versed in Old Testament narratives and could readily pass these on there non-Jewish neighbors.

¹⁹⁶ So Brashear, "The Greek Magical Papyri," 3440.

¹⁹⁷ A.D. Nock, "Studies in the Greco-Roman Beliefs of the Empire," *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* 45 (1925): 88. Nock avers that, "This concentration of interest on divine power rather than on divine personality gives a satisfactory explanation of the general absence of exclusiveness from Imperial paganism."

Furthermore, this ability of the Jews to influence the Greco-Roman world was also due to their unique cohesion as a religious group and their equally unique dispersion throughout the Greco-Roman world.¹⁹⁸

An additional factor was the preoccupation of some Jews with propagating magical arts, a dynamic which helped disseminate the idea that the Jewish God was the most powerful and this belief is echoed in numerous comments from the ancients who often betray some influence of Jewish religious belief. To cite but one example, Macrobius in his *Saturnalia* (1.18.19-21), editorializes on syncretism and the relative strength of the various national deities and states on the authority of the oracle of Apollo that:

When one has learned the unutterable mysteries one must conceal them, but since your understanding is limited, and your mind feeble, I tell you that the highest god of all is Iao, [who is called] Hades in winter, Zeus in the spring, Helios in the summer, and in autumn the wondrous Iao.

Just as striking is the impression made by the statement found in a third century C.E. *defixio* from Carthage which claims that “I bind you SABÔTH, the god who [brought] knowledge of all the magical arts...”¹⁹⁹

The inroads and extensive diffusion of magical practices colored with Jewish elements is also attested to in the comments Lucian makes in his *Alexander the False Prophet* (13). Delivering caustic sarcasm concerning the methods which Alexander employed to impress his potential clientele, Lucian characterizes Alexander’s address to them in the following manner, “Uttering a few meaningless words like Hebrew or Phoenician, he dazed the creatures, who did not know what he was saying.” Here the composition of the so-called *nomina barbara* probably consisted of (in part at least) Jewish names. In addition, Jewish historical figures were reputed to have extraordinary magical skills. For example, Apuleius, and also Pliny, considered Moses to

¹⁹⁸Simon, *Verus Israel*, 342.

¹⁹⁹As cited in Gagner, *Curse Tablets*, 63.

be a sorcerer,²⁰⁰ and in like fashion Pompeius Trogus (ca. first century C.E.) believed that Joseph became a master of magical arts while in Egypt.²⁰¹

This reputation is also attested to in the well-known narrative in Acts (19:13-20; cf. 13:6-12; cf. 8:9) that contains three separate accounts of Jewish magicians and exorcists that well attest the age and prevalence of this magical belief.

Given the central place that Oriental magical praxis held in the ancient world it comes as no surprise that names indigenous to the Near East were considered by the Greco-Roman world as having more power as Hopfner notes:

Denn auch schon diese landläufigen Götternamen der Orientalen hatten mehr Kraft und ein enges sympathisches Verhältnis zu dem Benannten als die entsprechenden griechischen Namen.²⁰²

Secondly, as I mentioned earlier, the Egyptians enjoyed preeminence with respect to ancient authoritative traditions. For example, if Iamblichus is at all reflective of his times, then it can be said with confidence that many Greco-Roman students of magic believed that this 'divine science' was first delivered to the Egyptians by the gods, with its accompanying divine names, rituals, and formulae, were subsequently taught to the Greeks.²⁰³ In a similar vein Hippolytus (*Haer.* V.II) claims that many Greeks believed concerning the Egyptians:

They assert that the Egyptians, who after the Phrygians, it is established, are of greater antiquity than all mankind, and who confessedly were the first to proclaim to all the rest of men the rites and orgies of, at the same time, all the gods, as well as the species and energies (of things)...

Celsus also professed this opinion, if we are to believe the report of Origen (*C. Cels.* 6.80), who charges that Celsus writes concerning this that "...on the present occasion it pleases

²⁰⁰*Apologia*, 90, *HN* 30.11. Another line of evidence is seen in a *PGM* work that we have already covered, the Eighth Book of Moses. The magician in this work claims to be Moses (V.109), no doubt wanting to imitate what he believed to be the great magical exploits of Moses in the Old Testament during his showdown with the magicians of Pharaoh's court (Ex. 7).

²⁰¹*Historiae Philippicae*. The quote is found also in the fourth century C.E. work, *Epitome of Justin*, 1:7. See Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Judaism*, 335-7.

²⁰²Hopfner, "Mageia," 340.

²⁰³*Myst.* 4, 7. Iamblichus passes on the prevalent view that the names of the gods came from Egypt as Herodotus (2. 52) also maintains, "And formerly the Pelasgians in all their sacrifices prayed unto the gods...but they gave them none of their names or surnames....But a long time afterward they learned from Egypt the names of the gods except Dionysus....And from that time thereafter when they sacrificed they used the names of the (Egyptian) gods. And the Greeks received them afterwards from the Pelasgians."

him to speak of the Egyptian people too as most divinely inspired, and that, too, from the earliest times...²⁰⁴

This same view is propagated in the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions,²⁰⁵ where in a report concerning the three sons of Noah the author writes that:

One of these, by name Ham, unhappily discovered the magical art, and handed down the instruction of it to one of his sons, who was called Mesraim, from whom the race of the Egyptians and Babylonians and Persians are descended. Him the nations who then existed called Zoroaster, admiring him as the first author of the magic art...

In this context it is quite interesting to note that Alon has convincingly demonstrated that the Hebrew phrase **בשם** had itself crept into the magical papyri in the form of **βασυμ**, **Βασμα**, and **Βασεν**, where in the latter case the Nûn replaced the Mêm as is customary at the end of a word.²⁰⁶ In the case of **Βασυμ** (PGM IV.1376 and elsewhere) the formula was even apparently transformed over time into the name of an angel!²⁰⁷

Apparently the profane use of this phrase became so prevalent that it naturally fell into disfavor with later Rabbinic authorities who felt pressed to come to the following halachic decision, "If a Gentile blesses **השם**, we respond 'Amen', (but if he blesses) **בשם**, we do not answer Amen, unless the entire benediction is heard." Here the fear of the use of the Name in a fashion similar to an incantation was evidently anticipated and the Rabbis accordingly mandated that a positive response could only come when it was clear that the blessing was done *to* [or for the sake of] the Name.²⁰⁸ This passage illustrates not only the prevalence which the Name came to occupy in theurgy, but also the important role that Semitic languages come to play in magical

²⁰⁴ Persians, too, were spoken of. See Tatian in his *Address to the Greeks* (I). Also, Celsus, reflecting no doubt the common opinion of the day, asserts concerning Christian thaumaturgists that they are no better than those magicians who have been taught by Egyptians (C. *Cels.* 1.48).

²⁰⁵ 4.27.

²⁰⁶ Gedalyahu Alon, *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*, trans. Israel Abrahams, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), 237-240. Also noted by Jacob, *ING*, 101 and Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 126.

²⁰⁷ Smith suggests that the angel *Basym* comes from a corruption of *Beshem*. See Morton Smith, "The Cult of YHWH," in *New Testament, Early Christianity, and Magic*, Vol. 2, Ed. Shaye J.D. Cohen, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996). All of chapter 40 deals with Jewish elements in the *PGM*.

²⁰⁸ *Tosephta Berakhot* v.11; cf. *PT Berakhot* viii.12c; *Sukka* iii.54a; *Megilla* i.72a. I am indebted to Alon's work for this insight. See *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World*, 245-46.

rites. In light of this belief it is not surprising that there exists scarcely no Latin or distinctly Roman magical elements in the papyri,²⁰⁹ as it was not considered a divine language.²¹⁰ Another significant indication of the predominance of Jewish elements in magical circles is seen in that even in Egypt Jewish terms (along with other pan-Semitic words) were preferred above all others.²¹¹

The cause for this high estimation of the divine name by the Greco-Roman world is not difficult to discern. First, as we have already seen, various Oriental cultures came to enjoy pride of place as the receivers and tradents of the most venerable religious traditions. It also stems from the fact that at least some Greeks were persuaded that the Jews had coined the name of their God with a view toward His extraordinary power.²¹² This perception dovetailed nicely with the widely prevalent view that taxonomies of various supra mundane beings could be drawn up—explicitly verifying that one could rank the spirits from the strongest to the weakest.²¹³

Assuredly the second major catalyst for this inordinate emphasis upon the name of the Jewish God was the Jewish reluctance to pronounce the Tetragrammaton (*nomen ineffabile*).²¹⁴ This prohibition and the secrecy which shrouded the correct pronunciation of the Name only served to reinforce the perception that the divine Name was kept secret *because* it was the magical name par excellence. Indeed, theurgical operations presumed that divine names carried

²⁰⁹So Brashear, “The Greek Magical Papyri,” 3425. Ogden cites the interesting case of at least one tablet from Hadrumentum where the Latin text reverts to Greek for the recording of the *voces magicae*, presumably because, as Ogden states, “this alphabet, apparently being considered more powerful.” See Ogden, “Binding Spells,” 49.

²¹⁰*Ibid.*, 3426.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*

²¹²*Praep. evang.*, 11.6.517d. On this point Eusebius relates his view of how the Jews derived the name of their God. I take from this that at least some members of Greco-Roman society had come to similar conclusions.

²¹³Although referencing the demonic, Seidel maintains that this taxonomic perspective is perhaps the sole novel feature of magic to have evolved during the Hellenistic Era. See Jonathan Lee Seidel, *Studies in Ancient Jewish Magic*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley (Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Dissertation Service, 1997), 106.

²¹⁴YHWH was not however alone in this respect for other divine names also could be forbidden to be spoken. For example, on at least one curse tablet the name of Seth-Typhon was forbidden to be expressed. See Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 704.

numinous power and from this it followed that the mightiest god would naturally possess the most powerful name.²¹⁵

Several consequences of this belief inevitably developed. The first consequence was that the highest god's name was so laden with power that one could not express it without dire consequences arising for the invoker. This claim of inexpressibility of the name of the highest god is witnessed to in the Leiden Papyrus where we read, Δεῦρο μοι ὁ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, ὁ παντοκράτωρ...οὗ ἐστὶν τὸ κρυπτόν ὄνομα καὶ ἄρρητον [ὅ] ἐν ἀνθρώπου στόματι λαληθῆναι οὐ δύναται...²¹⁶

Further light upon this subject is cast by the author of Pseudo-Philemon who writes that, ἔστι κἀν Ἀιδου κρίσις ἥνπερ ποιήσῃ θεὸς ὁ πάντων δεσπότης, οὗ τοῦνομα φοβερὸν, οὐδ' ἂν ὀνομάσαιμι ἐγώ.²¹⁷ Here the fear of even naming the name of the god was the cause of considerable angst.

As I have already noted, Lactantius Placidus' tale of an Etruscan who expired after hearing the true name of the demiurge, in addition to his story where it is claimed an ox died when it heard the ineffable name of God, also stand in support of the existence of this belief in Greco-Roman thought. Looking at the name of YHWH we find that the epitomizer Artapanus records a tale in which Pharaoh had Moses thrown in a prison after Moses had brazenly demanded that his fellow kinsmen be released from bondage. Thereafter, in the midst of the night the prison doors were cast open and Moses proceeded to leave the prison and enter the sleeping chambers of Pharaoh. Upon being woken by Moses, Pharaoh made jest of Moses and demanded that he reveal the name of the god who had abetted his escape. Straightaway Moses spoke the divine name to Pharaoh with the concomitant result that Pharaoh fell unconscious! According to the narrative, Moses revived Pharaoh and subsequently wrote down the secret name of God upon a tablet. Thereafter, one of Pharaoh's priests, who is said to have disparaged

²¹⁵Hopfner, § 701. Hopfner states after review that "...öfter in magischen Partien der Name des höchsten Gottes, eben jenes δημιουργός und κοσμοκράτωρ zwar angerufen wird, um den letzten und stärksten magischen Zwang auszuüben." Graf states, after review of the nature of the divine hierarchy in magical thought, "Um in dieser Hierarchie Macht zu haben, braucht der Zauberer bloß zu beweisen, daß er mit dem obersten Gott vertraut ist-gewöhnlich eben dadurch, daß er seinen geheimsten Namen kennt." See Graf, *Gottesnähe und Schadenzauber*, 201.

²¹⁶As quoted in Hopfner, *GAOZ*, § 701.

²¹⁷Ibid., § 702.

the sacred Name, was immediately thrown into a convulsive fit which killed him.²¹⁸ This claim of Artapanus mirrors and invites comparison with what the Leiden papyrus attests concerning Greco-Roman beliefs in this same area.²¹⁹

In the light shed both by the Leiden papyrus, Lactantius Placidus, and Artapanus, it is worth noting the assessment of Hopfner on this aspect of numinous names:

Je höher und mächtiger der Gott war, desto kräftiger und wirksamer musste auch sein wahrer Name sein. Daher ist es ganz folgerichtig anzunehmen, dass *der wahre Name des einen Urgottes, des Schöpfers (δημιουργός)* [emphasis Hopfner's], für Menschen überhaupt unerträglich sei; denn dieser Name war ja zugleich auch das Göttliche an sich und zwar in seiner höchsten Potenz, daher für die schwache Natur der Sterblichen viel zu stark; daher tötet er den, der ihn hört."²²⁰

It is in this context that the Jewish claim that they alone *knew* this secret name of the highest god brought the Jews into stark relief against other peoples of antiquity. This claim of the Jews can hardly be overemphasized. They were the sole possessors of the most powerful name among the many other numinous names. Such a claim was tantamount to making a claim to being the most potent magician (and exorcist), for the Jews had access to the most powerful name, as Hull states:

The greatest contribution of Judaism to international magic was the name of the living god. Use of *Ia*, *Iaō* and all sorts of variants, of Sabaoth, Adonai, and YHWH appear on almost every page of the magical papyri. It is easy to see how this would arise. To the natives of Egypt [or Greek magicians], the practices of Jewish colonies, especially the large one in Alexandria, must have seemed full of esoteric power, and a monotheistic religion which refused to pronounce the name of its secret and all-powerful deity was bound to be appropriated, whether understood or not, by those in constant search of still more mighty magical names.²²¹

I would hasten to add that this reluctance to pronounce the Name by Jews would have been seen by the Greco-Roman populace as something either analogous to the prohibition

²¹⁸As quoted in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* 9.27.24.

²¹⁹As I will note again later in the appendix on magical beliefs in Semitic and Egyptian cultures, according to an inscription dating from the times of Ramses IV (circa 1200 B.C.E.), speaking out loud the name of Ptah-Tatenen was considered to be a sin, as was the case for the true name of Amun. As quoted in László, *Zauberei im alten Ägypten*, 117. I mention here as an aside that Blau has mentioned that Alexandria was the possible source for the inception of the Name into Greco-Roman magic. See, Blau, *Das altjüdische Zaubерwesen*, 38-40.

²²⁰Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 701.

²²¹John M. Hull, *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition* (London: SCM Press, 1974), 31.

against speaking out the name of the Roman *Schutzgöttes*, or alternatively as something which falls under the stricture that the name of the highest god was forbidden to be known (*cuius scire non licet nomen*),²²² which as Proclus points out (*In Ti.* 2.84a), was applicable to the greatest god, the *δημιουργός*. In light of these claims, the knowledge of the ‘true’ name of this greatest god which the Jews claimed to possess naturally tended to heighten not only the reputation of the Jews, but also heightened curiosity over the name of the Jewish god.

Another factor worth considering is that apparently only in Judaism was the problem of demonic possession an integral component of their faith system.²²³ Other religions no doubt had concerns over demonic attacks and how one could best ward off evil spirits, but in general the concept of actual possession, was per se, a relatively ignored area.²²⁴ Further, this fact may in part explain the perception that Jewish magicians/exorcists were especially efficacious-considered preeminent even over Egyptian magicians.²²⁵

Finally I come to the last factor which helped to establish the Name as the magical name par excellence and that is that the miracles recorded in the Old Testament. These were of such impressive force that the Jews naturally drew attention to these events and understandably with some pride publicly proclaimed the glory and power of their god.²²⁶ Naturally, people desired to

²²²So Statius, *Thebais*, 4.515f., and Lactantius Placidus, *Commentarii Statii Thebaida*, 4.516.

²²³I take as my point of departure for this claim the interesting observation of Schwartz, who in his review of several magical gems found cause to maintain that the prevalence of Jewish names was in part predicated upon his belief that the Jews reserved a particularly elevated status for exorcism of the demonically possessed. Clearly other religions also concerned themselves with this aspect of religion and magic, but this does not blunt the opinion of Schwartz. I would only alter his conclusions to state that Judaism placed a greater emphasis upon this particular problem. In Schwartz’s original context he had just reviewed four magical texts and noted that the fourth, which deals with liberating a possessed person, was infused with Jewish elements. Schwartz then states, “...vielleicht ist es kein Zufall, daß die jüdische Religion bloß für die Befreiung eines Besessenen in Anspruch genommen wird, da diese im Gegensatz zu den drei anderen Bitten allein im Judentum bekannt ist.” Certainly, at least in Greek religion, possession by a *daimonion* could be seen as a positive thing. Also, Greek religion was taken with divination and demons that were believed to be able to convey the future to mankind. See Schwartz, “Papyri Magicae Graecae und Magische Gemmen,” 493.

²²⁴Certainly the Greeks originally held demons to be gods or at least god-like (*isotheos*). It was not until the time of Plato that we witness a growth (or possibly influx) of the concept of demons as evil beings. For an informative but brief discussion of the evidence consult Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press & Basil Blackwell, 1985), 179-181.

²²⁵Following Brashear, “Greek Magical Papyri,” 3426 fn. 222.

²²⁶Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 713.

invoke the 'the strongest god' (e.g. *PGM* XII. 238; *PGM* IV. 732-33; *PGM* XII. 284-85) and this helped to fuel interest in the divine name.

Certainly during the Hellenistic Era the influx of new, seemingly more powerful names, were pushing out the older traditional names as Betz observes, "In these texts the traditional deities have in principle been moved to a lower level...These deities can hold on to their power only if they are *identified with the highest cosmic deity*...[emphasis mine]."²²⁷ The natural inclination to invoke the greatest god, or the most powerful name that one knew, rapidly became directed to the Hebrew God. I turn now to this facet of the evidence.

For some the name of the Jewish deity seemed so powerful that it found a permanent home in Greek religious speculation. For example, if Porphyry is to be believed, the oracle of Apollo announced that the God of the Jews made all other gods shudder with fear.²²⁸

Furthermore, intaglios were often worn which had inscribed upon them a Greek equivalent for the divine Name (e.g. יהוה=πῑπῑ).²²⁹ Insofar as such amulets were intended to be worn continually we may reasonably deduce that the wearer believed that the toting of the Name would protect and repel misfortune. This belief even extended to the Jewish angelic host as witnessed to by the fact that the name Michael occurs 20 times in the magical papyri and Gabriel seven times.²³⁰ These angels not only functioned in areas of protection but were also called upon to mediate revelatory magic.²³¹ Moreover, they could act as functionaries in the carrying out of the request of the magician.²³²

²²⁷Hans Dieter Betz, "Secrecy in the Greek Magical Papyri," in *Secrecy and Concealment: Studies in the History of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Religions*, eds. Hans S. Kippenberg and Guy G. Stroumsa, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 161.

²²⁸*De Philosophia ex Oraculis Haurienda*, 30. Reference taken from Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 431-2.

²²⁹For an example of such an intaglio see Horsley, *New Documents, Vol. 4*, 232. Often if the Name was not written out of respect then a symbol which represented it would be engraved on the intaglio.

²³⁰As quoted in Arnold. See Clinton E. Arnold, *The Colossian Syncretism. The Interface Between Christianity and Folk Belief at Colossae*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2 Reihe, Eds. Martin Hengel and Otfried Hofius, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995), 20.

²³¹Arnold has an excellent section in his work which deals with various primary texts. See Arnold, *Colossian Syncretism*, 23-26.

²³²*Ibid.*, 26.

It may be that even the series (or more specifically the fixed arrangement) of vowels which is often cited in magical papyri, viz. ιαωουε, which is at variance with the established order of vowels in Greek, possibly derives from the myriad of cases in which the Greek transcription of the divine Name appears in the magical papyrus (i.e. Ιαω).²³³ In any event, the reciprocal contention, viz., that the Tetragrammaton contained the full magically significant seven vowels was an accepted theologoumenon in at least some circles.²³⁴

Before I depart this section I have one last pressing issue that I must attend to, viz. the issue of the dates of our sources. Now it might be objected, notwithstanding the acknowledgment that magical technique and theory were relatively static, that the sources upon which I am dependent are too late to serve as reliable witnesses for First Century practices. Such an assessment is hasty and without foundation. First, texts such as *PGM* XL, “the Curse of Artemesia,” dates to as early as the Fourth Century B.C.E.²³⁵ Secondly, it is widely recognized that the papyri betray clear evidence of being second and even third generation copies.²³⁶ Third, it is also acknowledged that several magical papyri texts contain remnants of spells and practices of the pre-Christian era.²³⁷

The antiquity of this use of the Name in magic is also confirmed by the observation of Urbach that the various epithets and profane surrogates which were employed in lieu of the Tetragrammaton, and which were subsequently absorbed into the magic that is displayed in the *PGM*, betray a lengthy evolutionary process.²³⁸

This process is most explicitly outlined by Origen in his *C. Cels.* 4.33. Prior to his expounding upon the power of the divine name Celsus had charged that the Jews have recourse

²³³ Simon, *Verus Israel*, 344.

²³⁴ Or so *Praep. evang.* XI.6. See also David Aune, “Ιαώ,” in *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der Antiken Welt*. Band XVII (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1996), 7 and Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet*, 39.

²³⁵ Brashear, “The Greek Magical Papyri,” 3430 and Ritner, “Egyptian Magical Practice,” 3360.

²³⁶ Brashear, *Ibid.*, 3415-3416.

²³⁷ *Ibid.* See Brashear’s interesting example of the ‘Philinna papyrus,’ which dates to perhaps 200 B.C.E. being preserved in *PGM* XX. See also his discussion of dating on pgs. 3419-3420.

²³⁸ Ephraim E Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1979), 126-7.

to tracing their genealogy only by allying themselves with shoddy magicians who employ “dark and ambiguous words[*nomina barbara?*], the meaning of which is veiled in obscurity.” Origen’s retort asserts that:

The names of these individuals possess such efficacy, when united to the Name of God, that not only do those belonging to the nation [Israel] employ [it] in their prayers to God, and in exorcizing demons, the words, “God of Abraham, and God of Isaac, and God of Jacob,” *but so also do almost all those who occupy themselves with incantations and magical rites. For there is found in treatises on magic in many countries such an invocation of God, and assumption of the divine Name, as implies a familiar use of it by these men in their dealings with demons.* [emphasis mine]

And further that:

Moreover, the phrases, the God of Israel, and the God of the Hebrews, and the God who drowned in the Red Sea the king of Egypt and the Egyptians, are formulae frequently employed against demons and certain wicked powers. [emphasis mine] And we learn the history of the names and their interpretation from those Hebrews, who in their national literature and national tongue dwell with pride upon these things, and explain their meaning.

A further indication of the antiquity of the use of the Name in Greco-Roman magic and religion is that almost all transcriptions of the Name recorded in the Fathers either derive from the magical papyri, or are grossly similar to those variants of the Tetragrammaton even from the earliest patristic witnesses.²³⁹ Moreover, some magical papyri which use the Name can be confidently dated to as early as the second century B.C.E. demonstrates that the use of the Name almost assuredly has roots which extend into the pre-Christian era.²⁴⁰

In fact, we may consolidate this conclusion by reviewing the pertinent evidence offered in the Book of Acts. Of particular import is chapter 19, which as I have already noted contains the story of the Jewish exorcists. The use of identical magical rituals and formula as we find in the *PGM* attest that these were en vogue in the First Century Hellenistic world.²⁴¹ Thus, we may

²³⁹So Blau, in dependence on the authority of Deissmann. See Blau, *Das Alphabet*, 130.

²⁴⁰ It is also worth noting that the introductory formula found in *PGM* I, 39-39 seems to indicate a Hebrew original which was corrupted upon being taken up into magical rites, or so Scholem believes. The magician here mistakenly believes that these angels are gods, an error no Jew would have made. The passage reads, “I conjure you by the God Jao, the God Abaoth, the God Adonai, the God Michael, the God Suriel, the God Gabriel, the God Raphael.” The use of compound names, or should I say misunderstanding of these names, suggests a Hebrew original that was taken up by others who did not know the Hebrew tongue. See Gershom G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*, (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960), 71.

²⁴¹As Kotansky has rightly observed. See Roy Kotansky, “Greek Exorcistic Amulets,” in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, eds. Marvin Meyers and Paul Mirecki, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 245.

firmly employ these texts in helping to grasp the profile of name-mysticism as it occurs in its First Century Hellenistic context.

In summary we can confidently posit that the following twelve points were integral components of the name-concept in Greco-Roman magic and religion:

1) The names of the gods and other supernatural agents were considered to be numinous and laden with power.

2) The names themselves were often thought to have an autonomous existence apart from the designated god or demon.

3) The names of the gods were indissolubly intertwined with the gods themselves, so much so that to control the former was to control the latter.

4) Foreign names and words (*nomina barbara*) were viewed as having more supernatural vitality than commonplace names.

5) Pursuant to point four, the rationale for the emphasis upon foreign names was in part due to the fact that magic in general, and the name-concept in particular, were heavily indebted to Eastern (especially Semitic and Egyptian) pollination of Greek religion.

6) The power, which was resident in the name, remained so only if the original language was utilized, or at least transliterated into the magical *lingua franca* of the theurgist/magician. In part this concept is derivative. Insofar as demons were viewed as having originated in specific geographic areas it appeared to the masses that they naturally responded to their 'native tongue.'

7) It was imperative for the supplicant to ascertain the "true" name of the god or demon. True names allowed for greater control over the numinous realm, per point 3.

8) The invocation of numinous names was arguably the major means in securing apotropaic power on behalf of the petitioner.

9) It was necessary for the god to reveal its 'true' name for only he or she was privy to it.

10) Some theurgists believed that they could generate a state of *sympatheia* with the gods or demons by demonstrating their proficiency in correctly apprehending, and adroitly applying, the appropriate rituals, appurtenances, sigla, *historiolae*, and invocational formula.

11) For many votaries a more profound apprehension of the mystery of the god or demon was often believed to be facilitated by utilizing onomatomantism. The number of the god or demon could be seen as being tantamount to a revelation about the nature of the divine being.

12) The most efficacious name (s) for tradents of the magical crafts were usually imputed to be those associated with the Tetragrammaton or its profane surrogates.

Given the deep and extensive nature of the evidence we are now in a position to appreciate the view which Heitmüller so forcefully promulgated:

*Er [the name] steht einerseits in engster mystischer Beziehung zu dem Wesen Gottes: er nimmt teil an diesem Wesen Gottes und partizipiert infolgedessen an dieser Macht....Andererseits hat er in gewissem Sinn selbstverständige Stellung und Bedeutung neben Gott; er ist eine Art Hypostase neben ihm..., ein Doppelgänger Gottes. [emphasis Heitmüller's]*²⁴²

²⁴²Heitmüller, *INJ*, 154.

CHAPTER THREE

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN JUDAISM

The Name of God played a greater role and had greater meaning in Judaism than in any other religion of Antiquity.²⁴³

As the quote above highlights, the name of God occupied a central place in Jewish theological reflection. As scholars have turned their attention to study this phenomenon they have, in the main, concentrated their efforts on three major areas. The first area involves quarrying for the philological source, and meaning of, the Tetragrammaton, or in some cases, seeking the grammatical origins and meaning of the phrase **יְהוָה**.²⁴⁴

The second area entails examination of the theological implications of the various permutations of, or surrogates for, the Name (e.g. El Elyon, El Olam, El-Shaddai, etc.) as found in various strands of traditions recorded in the Old Testament. This latter quest can be taxing because the name of God, in one form or the other, occurs approximately 350 times.²⁴⁵

The third area concerns itself with the use of the Tetragrammaton²⁴⁶ in Jewish circles. For my purposes only this last quest is of relevance. I shall not, therefore, take up the works of those scholars who treat the philological questions. Neither shall I endeavor to review those works that have attempted to explicate the practical, or theological, significance of the various Name permutations. Such works would carry my study too far afield. Therefore, I intend to limit myself to those works that have focused almost exclusively upon how the Name was employed among Jewish pietists in cultus, as well as the place that the Name held within the larger scope of Jewish theological speculation. In particular, I shall be looking for possible apotropaic and numinous applications, as well as various attributions or roles which were imputed to the divine name.

²⁴³ Martin Hengel. Personal communication, Nov 5th, 1997.

²⁴⁴ See for example, Julian Böhmer, *Das Biblische „Im Namen.“ Eine Sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung über das Hebräische **יְהוָה** und seine Griechischen Aequivalente (im besonderen Hinblick auf den Taufbefehl Matth. 28:19)* (Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlag, 1898).

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 42. The summary assessment of Exodus Rabba gives us some indication of how these names were viewed and states the matter well when it declares that, “Abbi Aba bar Memel [said]: The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses: You wish to know my name? I am named according to my actions. At different times I am called El Shaddai, Tzevaot, Elohim, YHWH [list of actions and correlative names follow].” *Exod. Rab.* 3.6.

²⁴⁶ Or its profane surrogates, inclusive also of other divine or numinous names.

Moreover, this review will entertain only the major overarching claims and conclusions of these scholars. I shall reserve a more specific treatment of their views for my analysis of those key Old Testament and Intertestamental passages that bear on my thesis. With this outline in hand, I shall begin my review.

Status Quaestionis

The first decade of the Twentieth Century witnessed the greatest outpouring of scholarly reflection upon the name-conception. No less than three major works were published during this interval. The first work was by Friedrich Giesebrecht.²⁴⁷ Giesebrecht held that in Jewish circles the Name was both a means of divine disclosure, a numinous object,²⁴⁸ as well as being a hypostatic entity (*selbstständiges Wesen*).²⁴⁹

Furthermore, the Name carries a special power (*besondere Kraft*) for the Jew in Antiquity,²⁵⁰ and could actually mediate power (*Machtmittel*).²⁵¹ Giesebrecht was also of the opinion that divine names, as numinous objects, carried their own specific numen.²⁵² By invoking one of these names the bearer of the name was constrained to do the bidding of the suppliant.²⁵³ Moreover, Giesebrecht envisioned the Name as being apotropaic,²⁵⁴ as well as being an agent of help or salvation (*Rettungsmittel*).²⁵⁵

Additionally, Giesebrecht also maintained that an integral part of the theology of the Deuteronomist was the notion that the Name was a hypostasis,²⁵⁶ a belief which, in his opinion,

²⁴⁷Friedrich Giesebrecht, *Die Alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre Religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage* (Königsberg: von Thomas & Oppermann, 1901).

²⁴⁸Ibid., 41-44.

²⁴⁹Ibid., 44.

²⁵⁰Ibid., 33.

²⁵¹Ibid., 41.

²⁵²Ibid., 95.

²⁵³Ibid. 90.

²⁵⁴Ibid., 22.

²⁵⁵Ibid., 41.

²⁵⁶Ibid., 33-37.

can be dated to at least the 8th Century B.C.E.²⁵⁷ This conception led Giesebrecht to posit that divine names formed a type of ‘real’ alter ego (*Nebengottheit* or *Doppelgänger*) of the bearer of the name.²⁵⁸ In keeping with this finding Giesebrecht also believed that early Israelite religion conceived of the Name in a very primitive manner which is best characterized as concrete and localized (i.e., discrete). Later, in the ongoing evolution of the religion a more abstract and transcendent view of the Name developed.²⁵⁹ Congruent with this line of thinking Giesebrecht also postulated that in the incipient stages of Israelite religion the Name, by virtue of its concretized localization, became a surrogate for YHWH Himself in Jewish cultus.²⁶⁰

Beyond this it should be noted that Giesebrecht’s work advanced the fruitful proposition that the elevated status given to the Name in Jewish cultus was facilitated in part by its usefulness in polemical contexts, that is, by attaching the Name to a particular cultic site the claim could be secured that divine discourse and interaction were sanctioned at that site. Thus, one sacred site could establish its dominance and legitimization over and against other rival sites.²⁶¹ This legitimizing function of the Name effectually bound the Name not only to the cultic site but also to the cultic activities which were carried there.

The next work is that of the Jewish scholar B. Jacob.²⁶² In reaction to the perceived excesses of Giesebrecht, Jacob’s work evolved into a broadside designed to engage polemically and blunt the force of Giesebrecht’s views.²⁶³

²⁵⁷Ibid., 36.

²⁵⁸Ibid.: 89, 91, 98.

²⁵⁹Ibid., 120.

²⁶⁰Ibid., 26-27. In fact Giesebrecht believes that the phrase “YHWH is His name” is itself a phrase at the center of many cultic activities. See pg. 68. He also believes that the name of God occupied a lead role in Jewish cultic acts. See pg. 33, 95.

²⁶¹Ibid., 38, 66.

²⁶²Benno Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes: Eine sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten und Neuen Testament*, (Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1903).

²⁶³Before Jacob had fully committed his research to writing Giesebrecht’s monograph became available to him. Consequently, Jacob’s study deviated from an independent investigation and became a polemical retort to Giesebrecht. The main body of the work is dedicated to refuting Giesebrecht. Unfortunately, Heitmüller’s study was published too late for Jacob to interact with it. See Jacob’s forward for fuller details.

It becomes apparent early on that Jacob resists any notion that the Old Testament contains any sort of name-mysticism.²⁶⁴ In his judgment name mysticism is derived solely from Egyptian religion and beliefs.²⁶⁵ In fact, this is Jacob's only source for he denies that any other Semitic religion, in its pristine primitive form, embraced any form of name-mysticism.²⁶⁶ For Jacob, all evidence for name-mysticism, both Jewish and Christian, as well as Greco-Roman, derives from the corrupting influence of Egyptian religion.²⁶⁷

To this it should also be noted that Jacob, *contra* Giesebrecht, denies that the Name was used as surrogate for God in Jewish cultus,²⁶⁸ although he does recognize that the Name was without doubt a centerpiece of Jewish cultic activity.²⁶⁹

As for his apologetic tone, I note, for example, that when taking up the *locus classicus* of Gen. 32:24-30, Jacob contends that the reason that the Angel of the Lord would not reveal his name is simply because angels do not have names!²⁷⁰ Not surprisingly Jacob also affirms the traditional date for the Pentateuch,²⁷¹ a position that entails a rejection of the JEPD theory of authorship. In keeping with this conservative approach Jacob rejects any suggestion that the Deuteronomist ever viewed the Name as a hypostasis; indeed, Jacob generally rejects the Deuteronomist Name theology, which is so generally accepted today.²⁷²

Along similar lines, Jacob rejects the validity of the evidence contained in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha for evidence of Jewish belief. For him, these works were reflective of nothing more than superstitious folk religion (*Aberglaube*),²⁷³ which, he contends, did not even

²⁶⁴Ibid., 48, 89.

²⁶⁵Ibid., 100, 106, 118.

²⁶⁶Ibid., 80.

²⁶⁷Ibid., 86.

²⁶⁸Ibid., 14ff.

²⁶⁹Ibid.

²⁷⁰Ibid., 23.

²⁷¹Ibid., 45.

²⁷²Ibid., 113-117.

²⁷³Ibid., 63, 65.

arise until after the Exile.²⁷⁴ More grievous yet is Jacob's flouting of the consensus dating for these sources. Jacob finds grist for his mill in his insistence that the evidence from many of these documents is not only post-Christian in date, but in fact reflects a stream of Judaism that may have been tainted by Christian name-mysticism.²⁷⁵

Jacob's only concession to Jewish name mysticism comes with his acknowledgement that the Essenes evidently did subscribe to such views.²⁷⁶ Whatever else may be said it is clear that Jacob intends to stake out a strong position intended to affirm a conservative Jewish perspective.

At first blush, Heitmüller's inclusion may seem a bit paradoxical given that the stated objective of his work was an examination of the use of the name of Jesus in Early Christianity (esp. baptism), but in his pursuit of the New Testament application of the name of Jesus Heitmüller devoted a fair amount of his work toward uncovering the Jewish background to this practice and thus his work deserves to be tabled in this review.

For Heitmüller the evidence was unequivocal that the Name was conceived of as a numinous agent,²⁷⁷ as well as a being an apotropaic shield,²⁷⁸ and additionally a source of healing (*Heilmittel*).²⁷⁹ In concert with these positions Heitmüller also maintains that the Name was fully hypostatic (*Doppelgänger*),²⁸⁰ which accordingly existed in close mystical union with God.²⁸¹

Of further interest is that Heitmüller put forth a plausible scenario to explain the seemingly marked increase in speculation over angelic names. The first link in his chain starts with the observation that during intertestamental times the unauthorized use of the Tetragrammaton was coming under increasing stricture. Thereafter, he contends that the proper

²⁷⁴Ibid., 18.

²⁷⁵Ibid., 68.

²⁷⁶Ibid., 106.

²⁷⁷Heitmüller, *I.N.I.* 142-144.

²⁷⁸Ibid., 144. An interesting point which Heitmüller raises is that the written name was believed to be the most effective source of apotropaic protection, presumably because it was enduring.

²⁷⁹Ibid., 140-141.

²⁸⁰Ibid., 154.

²⁸¹Ibid.

Tetragrammaton was coming under increasing stricture. Thereafter, he contends that the proper pronunciation of the Name became lost among the people. Insofar as the true name of a god is necessary in unleashing the power of the god the people had become hindered in their attempt to harness the divine power for their own use. Since, however, there was no prohibition concerning articulation of the names of the angels at least some Jewish conventicles began to engage in speculation about the proper names of the angels and their relevant sphere of operation.²⁸² On this showing, Heitmüller is able to claim that the prohibition of the articulation of the Name catalyzed a concomitant evolution and influence in Jewish name-philosophy.²⁸³ While I can envision even more plausible scenarios, Heitmüller's scheme is not without interest.

Over and above these considerations, Heitmüller was disposed to accept that the Name played the chief role in Jewish cultus,²⁸⁴ serving there, as it were, in a sacramental sense.²⁸⁵

After Heitmüller a long un-tenanted period ensued which lasted until 1921 when D. Friedrich Nägelsbach's *Der Name Gottes und Jesu nach dem Verständnis und dem Sprachgebrauch der Heiligen Schrift* appeared. Nägelsbach, as Jacob before him, took issue with Giesebrecht over whether intertestamental literature should be drawn upon to correctly inform us concerning Biblical religion.²⁸⁶ Nägelsbach, again like Jacob before him, maintained that the sole source worthy of discussion is the Old Testament. He also contended that the comparative History-of-Religion approach was methodologically unsound and that the only valid means to decipher the meaning and intent of the biblical authors was to undertake exegesis of the relevant passages in light of the rest of the Old Testament. In many respects Nägelsbach's conclusions mirror those of Jacob, although on numerous occasions his reasoning is somewhat different. Given this starting point Nägelsbach comes to the conclusion that the name of God was not

²⁸²Ibid., 156-157.

²⁸³Ibid., 157.

²⁸⁴Ibid., 30, 42, 168.

²⁸⁵Ibid., 155.

²⁸⁶ Friedrich D. Nägelsbach, *Der Name Gottes und Jesu nach dem Verständnis und dem Sprachgebrauch der Heiligen Schrift* (München: Müller & Fröhlich, 1921), 15. As far as I can tell this work has never been cited by other scholars who have subsequently dealt with this question. During my year at Tübingen I took leave and examined the library at Göttingen. The welcome result was the discovery of Nägelsbach's contribution.

viewed as a hypostasis.²⁸⁷ In concert with this finding Nägelsbach also insisted that the Name was not viewed as a numinous, apotropaic object.²⁸⁸

Carrying the work of these scholars further, Oskar Grether published his study in 1934.²⁸⁹ Like Heitmüller, Grether asserted that divine names were numinous and served as a medium of power (*Machtmittel*),²⁹⁰ as well as an apotropaic force (*Schutzmittel*),²⁹¹ by which one could compel the gods to do one's bidding.²⁹² Indeed, Grether maintained that the most ancient usage of divine names was as a mediating agent that was utilized to invoke the gods (*Rufmittel*).²⁹³

Moreover, in concert with Giesebrecht and Heitmüller, Grether maintained that the phrase יהוה בשם קרא was both at the heart of cultus, as well as serving as its terminus.²⁹⁴ Grether, however, contends that this phrase was originally derived from magical usage, not religious considerations.²⁹⁵ And with Jacob he believed that Egypt was at the center of the development concerning the belief that names were magical.²⁹⁶

²⁸⁷ Nägelsbach assures us that the Name is never grammatically the subject in any part of the OT and thus any notion that the Name could act independently of God is erroneous. See, *DNGJHS*, 14.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 20-27.

²⁸⁹ Oskar Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*, (Giessen: Alfred von Töpelmann, 1934).

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 19. Grether's observation was not meant to be universal in scope. Grether carefully discriminated between his sources, and thus, this view of the Name applies primarily to the Deuteronomist, the Psalmist, and the author of Jeremiah, among others.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 50.

²⁹² *Ibid.*, 18.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, 41, 175. Indeed, Grether was of the opinion that the prohibition against voicing the name of God in Ex. 20:7 (=Dt. 5:11) is meant to stop magical misapplication of the Name. See pg. 21.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 18-19. It is an interesting exercise to compare how Jacob and Grether come to such diametrically different conclusions on Old Testament spirituality. Jacob rejects any notion that the Name was believed to have actually resided in the Temple. For Jacob there exists not the slightest trace of name-mysticism in the Old Testament (pg. 48). For Grether, the Name was conceived of as residing in the Temple, for most people today a clearly superstitious belief, but Grether presses that this notion belongs in the rarified air of a high spirituality (*die hohe Geistigkeit*), unparalleled in any pagan religion of the time! See *NWGAT*, 34.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 18.

Where Grether perhaps deviated the most from prior scholars was in his emphasis that the Name was the medium through which God revealed Himself.²⁹⁷ Grether puts the matter quite simply: one must know the name of the god or goddess in order to know them truly and interact with them.²⁹⁸ Additionally, by invoking the name of the divinity the supplicant insured the vital presence of the divinity.²⁹⁹ Finally, Grether, as an indicator of the significant place the Name played in revelation, points to the fact that only in Israel was the 'true' name of the national god revealed to the people.³⁰⁰

Grether distinguishes himself further by advancing two particularly fascinating propositions. The first is his contention that the evolution of the name-concept from a magical, hypostatic theologoumenon towards a more transcendent conception was catalyzed by the destruction of the First Temple. Grether argues that insofar as the Name was perceived in pre-Exilic times as having its dwelling place (*Wohnstätten*) in the Temple, then with the destruction of the Temple this theologoumenon fell prey to these circumstances and helped forge, or more pointedly forced, a new conception of a more transcendent name-concept.³⁰¹ Conversely, as the view of God evolved into a more sophisticated and transcendent one the Name took on an even more important role in serving as the intermediary between the now distant God and His people.³⁰²

Succinctly summarized, Grether's understanding posits three stages of development. The first is the early mythopoetic conception of the magical use of the Name in cultus and magic, which emphasizes the power in the Name. Secondly, the pivotal role which the Name comes to play in the theology of the Deuteronomist and thirdly, in the post-Deuteronomic era the people viewed the Name as a surrogate for YHWH Himself.

²⁹⁷Ibid.

²⁹⁸Ibid.

²⁹⁹Ibid., 19.

³⁰⁰Ibid., 176. Grether means that YHWH possessed no 'hidden' name like the gods of the nations.

³⁰¹Ibid., 43.

³⁰²Ibid., 179.

The second proposition revolves around the issue of what symbolic role the Name played in both cultus and practical theology. With respect to the cult, Grether believed that the Name functioned in an analogous fashion as an idol in pagan sanctuaries.³⁰³ By this Grether means that insofar as the idol was literally the earthly representation, or even embodiment, of the deity, the Name served a similar function in Judaism. The second aspect is a direct corollary of the first, viz. that the Name served as an earthly power-laden proxy for the heavenly enthroned God. Thus, on earth, the Name served as a surrogate for God in matters pertaining to the numinous realm (e.g., miracles, prophecy, healing, etc.).³⁰⁴ With this review in hand, I shall now turn to the Jewish evidence.

³⁰³Ibid., 34.

³⁰⁴Ibid.

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN JEWISH FAITH AND PRACTICE

In order to measure the breadth of the name-concept in Judaism³⁰⁵ I shall partition my inquiry into three different types of sources that exhibit impeccable Jewish parentage. The first will be comprised of exclusively literary texts. Within this group I shall first focus upon several Old Testament passages which were the progenitors (in part) of the name-concept in Judaism. I should at this point state that I do not intend to perform a detailed exegesis of each relevant passage. There are many scholars whose competence in Old Testament studies far exceeds my own and who have already performed this task. Accordingly, I intend only to flag these passages and briefly review what scholars have concluded about them. In addition, given the constraints of the scope of this inquiry, I shall, when it becomes convenient, review Old Testament texts together with related texts drawn from the Intertestamental Era. By interweaving pertinent non-canonical and canonical materials together I hope to achieve brevity that would be otherwise unattainable.

My second inquiry, also devoted to literary texts, will review the name-concept during the Intertestamental Era as found in non-canonical sources. I intend to catalog briefly any passages that are of pertinence to my inquiry. Here my aim will be to note how extensive the name-concept appears to have been within certain books, or within certain communities.

In the third class of evidence, I shall examine explicitly magical materials, some of which will be literary, along with other material, including amulets, incantation bowls, and various other non-literary miscellanea.

Finally, at the end of my review, I shall collate the evidence into its various phenomenological categories. This will facilitate comparison with the Early Christian material that will be treated later.

³⁰⁵ For those interested in reviewing the historical lineaments of the Semitic name-concept, I have reviewed some material in Appendix Five.

FIVE FOUNDATIONAL PASSAGES FOR UNDERSTANDING THE NAME-CONCEPT IN JUDAISM

The phrase **בשם** occurs approximately 133 times in the O.T.,³⁰⁶ while the related phrase **לשם** occurs approximately 56 times.³⁰⁷ In fact, the Name (**השם**) was in time to become one of the most oft used surrogates for the Tetragrammaton.³⁰⁸ Of further interest is the fact that save for one exception (Ps. 69:31; and here it is **שם-אלהים**), the expression **בשם אלהים** never occurs in the O.T.³⁰⁹ Of course my interest here lies in those passages which helped shape the name-concept in Judaic thought. There are in the main 5 major passages that provided the foundation for the development of the name-concept. I shall turn to these now.

My first text is the well-known story of Jacob's encounter with an angel in Gen. 32:25-30. Here we read that:

Then Jacob was left alone, and a man wrestled with him until daybreak...Then he said, Let me go, for the dawn is breaking. But he said, I will not let you go unless you bless me. So he said to him, What is your name? And he said, Jacob. And he said, Your name shall no longer be Jacob, but Israel; for you have striven with God and with men and have prevailed. Then Jacob asked him and said, Please tell me your name. But he said Why is it that you ask my name? And he blessed him and named the place Peniel, for he said, I have seen God face to face, yet my life has been preserved.

The angel's curious refusal to state the name provided Heitmüller a springboard for his views. In an interesting take on this passage Heitmüller maintains that when properly viewed in a historical-critical context the request by Jacob for the angels name was designed to be used as an agent (to exert control) which Jacob could use to command the divine being. The refusal to yield the name is likewise seen to be a defensive measure designed to keep the power of the name out of Jacob's hands.³¹⁰

³⁰⁶According to Boehmer's count. See, *Das Biblische „Im Namen*, " 4.

³⁰⁷Ibid. Also Jacob, *INJ*, 19.

³⁰⁸Ruck-Schröder quotes Cohon to this effect. His article is Samuel S. Cohen, "The Name of God: A Study in Rabbinic Theology," *HUCA* 23/1 (1950/51). See also, *DNGJNT*, 4 fn.4.

³⁰⁹Boehmer, *Das Biblische „Im Namen*, " 22.

³¹⁰So Heitmüller, *INJ*, 166; Grether, *NWGAT*, 18 and Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 80.

Nägelsbach takes a contrary view. He counters that Jacob had inquired after the name only after he had already defeated the messenger. Accordingly, Nägelsbach stakes out the position that the name could not have been seen as something that Jacob could use to defeat the angel.³¹¹

Whatever one thinks concerning the timing of the initial request, the refusal to give the name may reflect the common perception, as Heitmüller conjectured, that a divine being could be controlled through its name, a notion which was quite prevalent in the Ancient Near East.³¹² In this context I draw attention to the work of Grether, who claims that this passage provides the springboard for the later development of the formulaic *יְהוָה בְּשֵׁם קָרָא*, insofar as this formula presupposes that a divine being [in this case God] could be ‘called up’ by use of his name.³¹³

In two interesting antitheses to this position Jacob, on the one hand, proposes what I consider to be the wholly unwarranted reading that the angel does not divulge its name for it simply did not have one due to the fact that it has no personality.³¹⁴ And Duhm, equally unwarranted, believes that the angel refuses to disclose his name because his appearance was a one-time event.³¹⁵ I think it far more likely either that Heitmüller’s view is correct, or that the passage should be read as an attempt by the angel to beg off disclosing his name so that he could deflect any veneration that was due to God alone.³¹⁶ Still, whatever one makes of these various positions, it is clear that the request to learn the name amply displays the importance of names in ancient Semitic thought.

³¹¹ Nägelsbach, *DNGJHS*, 22.

³¹² See Appendix Five for more details.

³¹³ Grether, *NWGAT*, 18-19.

³¹⁴ Jacob, *ING*, 23.

³¹⁵ Hans Duhm, *Der Verkehr Gottes mit den Menschen im Alten Testament* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1926), 14.

³¹⁶ Other scholars see the Angel as a manifestation of YHWH. Von Heinz, for example, points to Tob. 12:15 and avers that lesser angels demonstrate no such reluctance to disclose their names, and hence, the Angel of the Lord fails to do so because he is not an angel, but rather YHWH. Von Heinz states, “sowohl Erzähler wie Zuhörer wissen von Anfang an ganz genau, daß es Jahwe ist, der da erschienen ist...” Kruse Von Heinz, “Der Wunderbare Name: Zu Herkunft und Sinngehalt des Jahwe-Namens,” *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 112 (1990): 385.

The second of my five texts is the Old Epic account of Ex. 3:13-15, where God reveals Himself to Moses in a unique way-He reveals His name to him-something that no other human had the privilege of prior to this. The text reads:

Then Moses said to God, "Behold, I am going to the sons of Israel, and I shall say to them, 'The God of your fathers has sent me to you.' Now they may say to me, 'What is His name?' What shall I say to them?" 14 And God said to Moses, "I AM WHO I AM"; and He said, "Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, 'I AM has sent me to you.'" 15 And God, furthermore, said to Moses, "Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, 'The LORD, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you.' This is My name forever, and this is My memorial-name to all generations.

To this should be added the narrative of Ex. 6: 2-3, from the Priestly source, where God reveals His Name to Moses:

I am YHWH. I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, as God Almighty, but by my name YHWH I did not make myself known to them.

First it should be noted that this declaration is intended to stand in contrast to Gen. 17:1, where God had given His name previously as El Shaddai.³¹⁷ The giving of the Name signifies a new stage in the relationship between Israel and YHWH,³¹⁸ a phase in which YHWH will be present among His people.³¹⁹ Clearly both narratives are concerned to highlight YHWH as the *Deus praesens*-the present God, and that an integral component of this abiding presence is the disclosure of the Name. This self-disclosure was to prove so decisive for the relationship of Israel to her God that it has led several exegetes to view this disclosure as the very foundational core of the Old Testament.³²⁰ Indeed, the disclosure of the Name was to have a lasting impact on Jewish perceptions both of God and of the Name. Several of these perceptions are worth mentioning.

³¹⁷See, however, Croatto who contends that God does not disclose His name here but only discloses something of His salvific presence with His people. See Severino J.Croatto, "Die relecture des Jahwe-Namens. Hermeneutische Überlegungen zu Ex 3,1-15 und 6,2-13," *Evangelische Theologie* 51 (1991): 42.

³¹⁸Daniel Prem Niles, *The Name of God in Israel's Worship: The Theological Importance of the Name Yahweh*, Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, (Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Dissertation Services, 1998), 119.

³¹⁹ Ex.29:45

³²⁰ An excellent example here is Walter Zimmerli. An interesting study in this regard, especially with respect to the role that the disclosure of the divine name plays, is Jochen Motte, *Biblische Theologie nach Walter Zimmerli: Darstellung und Würdigung der alttestamentlichen Theologie Walter Zimmerlis und der sich aus ihr ergebenden Perspektive zum Neuen Testament in systematisch-theologischer Sicht* (Frankfurt am Main: Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1995).

First, irrespective of how we understand the Name today it appears quite probable that the original audience understood the Name to signify, among other things, that their God was independent of all other creatures or other gods-He was totally independent and totally unique³²¹-thus forming one of the pillars for the full blown monotheism that we find in Judaism.³²² In point of fact, the very act of disclosure carried with it the notion that this god was to be distinguished from all other gods. The importance of this notion can be seen in the fact that later prophets were to maintain that the true people of God would know His name.³²³ The import of the disclosure of the Name can also be seen in the fact that the Decalogue prohibits the use of icons or material objects to represent God, and this paved the way for the Name to assume this role, in a manner of speaking.

Secondly, this revelation of the 'authentic' Name allowed for proper cultus to ensue for it was always a matter of utmost importance to have the true name of the god in order to invoke him properly and thus to worship him properly. Accordingly, such practices could be carried out with the full power and authority that the true name carried.³²⁴ And now, in contrast to the other gods that had secret names, YHWH had disclosed His Name.

Third, the disclosure of the Name provided the mortar and brick for the erection of the concept that the name of God was a medium of revelation-the medium for the *Deus revelatus*-a connotation not readily paralleled among the other religions of the day.³²⁵ This text also set into motion the conception that the Name was *the* medium of revelation.³²⁶

³²¹Grether, *NWGAT*, 7.

³²²Von Heinz rightfully calls the revelation of the divine name the true beginnings of monotheism in the Ancient Near East. See, "Der Wunderbare Name: Zu Herkunft und Sinngehalt des Jahwe-Namens," 401.

³²³Is. 52:6 and Jer. 16:21.

³²⁴Niles, in my judgment, has altogether missed the point of the significance of the 'true' name. He contends that the formula 'invoke the name of NN' did not have magical overtones in Ancient Israel; that is Biblical Religion, because the formula is only used with the Tetragrammaton. However, this is precisely the point of magical conceptions concerning numinous names as I have demonstrated. It was the 'true' name of the deity, which carried the numinous power. Still, I do not deny that Ancient Israel did not normally attempt to coerce YHWH to do its bidding simply because His name was invoked. For Niles' views, see *TNGIW*, 191-192.

³²⁵Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 255.

³²⁶*Ibid.* As Grether puts the matter, "Das Tetragramm bezeichnet Gott als den sich offenbarenden, als den *Deus revelatus*."

Fourthly, the disclosure of the Name to Moses was to serve as the ultimate authentication of Moses' mission.³²⁷

Now insofar as Moses received this name in order to authenticate his mission, as well as to confront Pharaoh, it is rather probable that later Jewish tradents of this lore were led to believe that God had handed over to Moses an overpowering weapon.³²⁸

The potency of this weapon can be seen not only in the fact that it is with the Name that the most powerful potentate was to be confronted, but also in the fact that its authority and power were efficacious in this foreign land—indeed a land of oppression.³²⁹

Another facet of this revelation, at least according to Bietenhard, is that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the disclosure of the Name was meant to convey that while the Name was powerful it was not a secret magical Name, in contrast to the names of foreign gods.³³⁰

All of the above considerations led Zimmerli to state that the disclosure of the Name stands as the center of OT revelation, while Besnard was led to claim that “L’histoire de la Révélation peut se lire comme l’histoire de l’enracinement du nom de Yahvé dans les peuples et dans les cœurs...,” and, “Pour la tradition sacerdotale le nom de Yahvé était avant tout l’élément distinctif de l’Alliance mosaïque.”³³¹

The third foundational text which laid the groundwork for the elevation of the Name comes from Exodus 20:7, where we read:

You shall not take the Name of the Lord your God in vain, for the Lord will not leave him unpunished who takes His Name in vain.

³²⁷ Tryggve N.D. Mettinger, *In Search of God. The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names*, trans. Frederick H. Cryer, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 23.

³²⁸ Jacob is probably correct in his hypothesis that this story helped lead to the belief that an aura of supernatural power enshrouded the Name. See *ING*, 109. An interesting analog is found in the Samaritan document *Memar Marqah*. At 1.3 God states to Moses, “I have given him My Name, so that he need not fear.” Indeed, the Name imparts to Moses some degree of its numinous prophylactic power as stated in 1.3, “Receive authority from Me and set it in your heart, for all your enemies will fall before you...Who will be able to stand before you, when My great Name is with you? Verily, every foe will fall before you as suddenly as evening falls.” As quoted in Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985), 119.

³²⁹ Grether, *NWGAT*, 8.

³³⁰ So Bietenhard, “ὄνομα,” 254. Von Rad notes the disclosure of God’s name here demonstrates that it was never to be held as a secret mystery in Israel. See *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band I*, 198.

³³¹ A.-M. Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom. Quiconque invoquera le nom du Seigneur sera sauvé. Joël 3,5*. *Lectio Divina* 35 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1962), 178.

It should occasion no surprise that this prohibition conditioned the future evolution of the name-concept as Heitmüller correctly pointed out.³³² Certainly, the sacredness of the articulated Name engendered a curiosity and reverence for the power of the Name in both Jewish and non-Jewish circles. And no doubt there is some semblance of truth in the oft-repeated charge that one of the primary reasons for prohibiting the Name to be spoken in vain was to interdict its use in magic.³³³ Certainly, it seems true that later purveyors of the mystery of the Name wanted to interdict any use of the Name in theurgy.³³⁴

It remains then in this context to note that the translators of the LXX, at Lev. 24:16, probably understood this passage to include death for expressing the Name because of its association with magical practices.³³⁵ In addition, the commandment may also have had in view the misuse of the Name in false prophecies.³³⁶ Moreover, the command also appears to attempt to limit the use of the Name in oaths and curses.³³⁷ In any event, further evolution of this command led to a complete prohibition of any articulation of the Name by Rabbis, who often employed surrogates. With respect to the magical conception of the Name I shall have more to say later.

³³²Heitmüller, *INJ*, 157: "Hinderte somit das theologische Verbot des Jahve-Namens thatsächlich [sic] nicht seinen Gebrauch, so hatte es auf der anderen Seite positiven Einfluss auf die Gestaltung der Namen-Philosophie."

³³³*Ibid.*, 156: "Und was den Gebrauch in der Praxis, d.h. in der Magie und Theurgie, betrifft, so beweist gerade auch in diesem Verbot, dass er im Schwange war" And Von Rad speculates that $\kappa\omega$ was originally used for magic. See *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band I*, 197. Another factor that tells in favor of this interpretation is that magic plays a surprisingly narrow role in the Old Testament when we compare the O.T. to other contemporary religions in the area as Eissfeldt pointed out. See Otto Eissfeldt, "Jahwe-Name und Zauberwesen," in *Kleine Schriften Erster Band*, eds. Rudolf Sellheim and Fritz Maass, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1962), 150. For further discussion on the use of the Name and magic see also Simon, *Verus Israel*, 344; Grether, *NWGT*, 21; Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 254; Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 90; H. Schüngel-Straumann, "Überlegungen zum Jahwe-Namen in den Gottesgeboten des Dekalogs," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 38.2 (March/April 1982): 69; cf. Jacob, *ING*, 16; Johannes Mehlmann, *Der "Name" Gottes im Alten Testament* (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1956), 75; K. Baltzer, "Namenglaube" in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3rd Ed., V. 4. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960): 1303; and Eissfeldt, "Jahwe-Name und Zauberwesen," 157.

³³⁴e.g., *Sam. Targ.* 24:11ff.

³³⁵The text reads: καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ λάλησον καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτοὺς Ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἐὰν καταράσῃται θεόν, ἁμαρτίαν λήμψεται, ¹⁶ὀνομάζων δὲ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θανάτῳ θανατούσθω, λίθοις λιθοβολεῖτω αὐτὸν πᾶσα συναγωγή Ἰσραὴλ [emphasis mine], ἐάν τε προσήλυτος ἐάν τε αὐτόχθων, ἐν τῷ ὀνομάσαι αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τελευτάτω.

³³⁶Werner H. Schmidt, *Die Zehn Gebote im Rahmen Alttestamentlicher Ethik* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993), 83.

³³⁷*Ibid.*, 80-81.

The last of my four texts comes from Exodus 23:20-21, which reads:

I am going to send an angel in front of you, to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place that I have prepared. Be attentive to him and listen to his voice; do not rebel against him, for he will not pardon your transgression; for my Name is in him.

For somewhat obvious reasons, this passage was to play an important role in the development of the name-concept in Judaism. In many respects, it became the *locus classicus* for the future evolution of the Jewish name-concept.³³⁸ Here, the line of demarcation between God and the Angel of Lord becomes effaced in a tangible way—a blurring mediated almost exclusively by the transference of the Name to the Angel, and this in spite of the fact, at least in the opinion of one scholar, that the sending of the angel indicates that he is not to be identified with God.³³⁹ Furthermore, YHWH and the angel seem to blend into one another as the tradition continued to evolve.³⁴⁰

Nonetheless, the function of the Name is not expressly stated and rather prompts the question of what the precise function of the Name was. Certainly the Angel of the Lord was sufficient in and of himself to lead the people to the land of promise. What then is the function here of the implantation of the Name in the angel?

Its first function appears to be that it was a symbol and guarantee of the presence of God Himself—for where His Name is there is where His presence will be.³⁴¹ Indeed, it is this direct presence of God that makes disobedience against the Angel of the Lord unforgivable for the

³³⁸Richard Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, (London: SCM Press, 1970), 42.

³³⁹Fritz Guggisburg, *Die Gestalt des Mal'ak Jahwe im Alten Testament*, Ph.D. Thesis Presented to the Faculté de Théologie l'Université de Neuchâtel, Neuchâtel, (Neuchâtel: von Dach Druck AG, 1979), 60-61.

³⁴⁰Baumgartner comments, "...in eigenartigem Wechsel mit Jahwe selber steht; der M.-J. Wandelt auf Erden, erscheint den Menschen und unterhält sich mit ihnen, wobei er bald redet, wie wenn er Gott selber wäre, und bald sich von ihm unterscheidet; aber dann ist wiederum Gott, der hört und sieht und redet, und die betreffenden Menschen behaupten auch, Gott selber gesehen zu haben (Gen 16,13, Ri. 13,22)." Also, Von Rad identifies Gen 21:11 ff.; 22:11 ff.; 31:11 ff.; Ex. 3:2 ff.; and Jud. 6:17 ff., as examples of this phenomenon. Giesebrecht also concurs. See Walter Baumgartner, *Zum Alten Testament und Seiner Umwelt: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959), 23 and Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band I*, 300. For further reading please consult Hermann Röttger, *Mal'ak Jahwe - Bote von Gott: die Vorstellung von Gottes Boten im hebräische Alten Testament* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 1978) and Giesebrecht, *DATSGN*, 119.

³⁴¹Grether, *NWGAT*, 29. As Guggisburg notes, the Name in the Angel indicates that God Himself is present in the Angel. Still, it should be pointed out that Nägelsbach resisted this interpretation and held that the implantation of the Name signifies only that the angel came in the commission of YHWH. See Nägelsbach, *DNGJHS*, 64 and Guggisburg, *Die Gestalt des Mal'ak Jahwe im Alten Testament*, 61.

disobedience is not against the Angel, but rather against God Himself.³⁴² The second function which the implantation of the Name serves is that of legitimizing the Angel of the Lord as God's representative.³⁴³ Accordingly, the emplacement of the Name grants to the bearer the authority to carry out activities normally reserved for God alone.³⁴⁴ In this respect the Name served the same legitimating function that it did for Moses.

With these observations in hand a brief tracing of the further use and development of this motif would be instructive. Moving diachronically, I shall survey the continuation of this tradition by the tradents of Jewish angelological lore.

The Angel is first encountered in Gen. 16:7-14 where Hagar, after a dialogical encounter with the Angel of Lord says that, "the Lord", and "God", had spoken to her (v. 13). In Gen. 18:2 three men appear to Abraham, yet one of them is YHWH (v.1), while 19:1 suggests that the other two men are angels. In his commentary on this passage Philo envisions that one of the angels is actually YHWH, while the other is nebulously conceived of as some extension of YHWH (*De Abrahamo* 142-143). This creative exegesis should generate little surprise, for Philo clearly believes that God can assume angelomorphic form on occasion (*De Somniis* I.232).

Of further interest is the fact that in later speculation another hypostatic agent, Wisdom, is the one who leads Israel from Egypt instead of the Angel of the Lord (*Wis.* 10:15-7). In conjunction with this I also note that Philo aligns the Logos doctrine with the Name doctrine in his *De Confusione Linguarum* (146), where we find:

And even if there be not as yet any one who is worthy to be called a son of God, nevertheless let him labor earnestly to be adorned according to his first-born word, the eldest of his angels, as the great archangel of many names; for he is called, the authority, and *the Name of God* [emphasis mine], and the Word...³⁴⁵

³⁴²Ibid.

³⁴³Ibid.

³⁴⁴Correctly noted by Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 255. It is of some interest to consider Giesebrecht's claim that the manner in which the angel is addressed, as well as the how he speaks, indicates that the angel is none other than YHWH Himself. See *DATSGN*, 119.

³⁴⁵ Philo, in *Som.* I, 230-33, speaks of Moses having received the divine name, a name which embodies that aspect of the divine reality that mankind is incapable of understanding. It is by this equation of revelation through God's word, and the Name, that the *logos* and the Name become associated together. An additional (possible) element is D.T. Runia's observation that Philo's Logos is "That aspect or part of the divine that stands in relation to created reality." Thus, the Logos functions very much in the same sense as the Name in Old Testament revelation, i.e. they are that side of God turned toward mankind. Runia's quote is found in Davies, *The Name and Way of the*

Further, Philo conceives that the Logos holds the “eldership among the angels” (*De Conf. Ling.* 146)-a position derived from the traditions concerning the Angel of the Lord. This is manifest in Philo’s equation between the Logos and the Name.

As I have already mentioned Philo equates the Name to the Angel of the Lord and the Logos. Accordingly, what Philo attributes to the one conception can logically be readily transferred to the other. In this capacity it is instructive to note that Philo explains that the Logos appears as a god to mankind.³⁴⁶ The Logos is both the medium through whom the world is brought into being,³⁴⁷ and by extension its support. The Logos is even called the High Priest by Philo.³⁴⁸

This conflation of the Logos and the Name in Philo suggests that the Angel of the Lord, by virtue of its possession of the Name, had already begun to take on the outlines of a manifestation of God.

Moving along intertextual lines, the account of the Abrahamic sacrifices found in Gen.15: 9, is rehearsed in *The Apocalypse of Abraham* (12:8), but here it was the angel Iaoel who commands Abraham to cut the animal sacrifices in two. Yet in Gen. 15:9 it is YHWH who issues the imperative. And in a paraphrase of the event in Gen.32: 24-30, where Jacob wrestles with an angel, *Test. Jac.* 2:14-15 states:

Blessed are you also, O Jacob, for you have seen God face to face. You saw the angel of the God-may he be exalted!...Then you beheld the Lord sitting at its top [of the ladder] with a power which no one could describe.

The angel of the Lord is again encountered in *Apocalypse of Abraham* 10:3, 7-8. In the first passage we read of Abraham being prostrate subsequent to hearing the voice of the YHWH. Thereafter, the text reads:

Lord, 113. For Runia see D.T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, *Philosophia Antiqua* 44, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), 449.

³⁴⁶ *Legum Allegoriae* 3.207, *Questiones et Solutiones in Genesisu* 2.62.

³⁴⁷ *De Fuga et Inventione* 2.12. Cf. *De Fuga et Inventione* 20.109. This remarkable theologoumenon finds ready parallels in later Jewish tradition. For example, in the Isaiah Targum 45:12, we find the following, “I by my *Memra* made the earth and created man upon it...[emphasis from original translator].” Translation from Bruce D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum, Introduction, Translation, Apparatus, and Notes*, *The Aramaic Bible V. 11*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 90.

³⁴⁸ *De Gigantibus* 12.52; *De Somniis* 1.215; *De Migratione Abrahami* 102.

I heard the voice speaking, "Go, Iaoel of the same name, through the mediation of my ineffable name, consecrate this man for me and strengthen him against his trembling.

In the second reference to Iaoel we encounter Iaoel speaking in the first person concerning his mission and his essence:

I am sent to strengthen you and to bless you in the name of God...I am Iaoel and I was called so by Him who moves that which existed in me on the seventh expanse upon the firmament, a power in virtue of the ineffable Name that is dwelling in me.

Returning to the Old Testament we find, in Ex. 3:2, that although it is the Angel of the Lord that appears to Moses, curiously the conversation is between Moses and YHWH (v.4). This conflation is further accentuated when in v. 2 the Angel is located within the bush, yet in v. 4 God is also located within the bush. In Judges 6:11-22 the Angel of the Lord comes to Gideon (vv. 11-2), yet in v. 14 YHWH becomes the speaker. Furthermore, these appearances at cultic sites, which are normally reserved for YHWH, further blur the lines between YHWH and His Angel.

In I Chron. 21:15-30 YHWH dispatches His angel to appear at the threshing floor of Ornan. However, during the angelophany David prays to YHWH. Adjunctively, II Chron. 3:1-2 intimates in its recitation of the events that YHWH appeared to David at the threshing floor.

A similar representation of the angel of the Lord, but this time with respect to Jacob, is found in the fragment of the *Prayer of Joseph* which is preserved in Origen's *In Johannem Commentarius* (II.31). The text that Origen preserves for us is noteworthy. Its evident point of departure is the narrative in Gen. 32:29ff., where Jacob wrestles with an angel. But in this text a remarkable transformation of the story occurs:

If one accepts from the apocrypha presently in use among the Hebrews the one entitled 'The Prayer of Joseph,' he will derive from it exactly this teaching....I Jacob who am speaking with you, am also Israel, an angel of God and a ruling spirit...And when I was coming up from Syria Mesopotamia, Uriel, the angel of God came out and said that I had descended to earth and I had tabernacled among men and that I had been called by the name Jacob. He envied me and fought with me and wrestled with me saying that his name and the Name of Him that is before every angel was to be above mine. I told him his name and what rank he held among the sons of God: 'Are you not Uriel, the eighth after me and I, Israel, the archangel of the power of the Lord and the chief captain among the sons of God?'...And I called upon my God by the inextinguishable Name...

Finally, in the later text known as III Enoch (12:5) the Angel of the Lord, who is conflated with the figure of Metatron, is claimed to be worthy of exaltation because the Name had been deposited in him.

Further observation of the Angel of the Lord leads one to conclude that it was also believed that the Angel interceded on behalf of God's people.³⁴⁹ Passages such as *Test. Dan* 6:2 (cf. I Enoch 40:6, where one of the four angels prays for mankind) attest to this function.

In light of the evidence which has been adduced it seems clear that by the First Century the name-conception had produced new nuances of the Name-Angel of the Lord combination depicted in Ex. 23:20-21.³⁵⁰ Beyond dispute is Boehmer's estimation that the Angel is warranted to act as a surrogate for God because the Name is in him. Indeed, if knowledge of the true name of God endorses one to be His representative³⁵¹ then how much more might the Angel represent Him because he actually *possesses* the Name.³⁵² Indeed, it is the possession of the Name that grants the Angel the divine prerogative to forgive sins.³⁵³

Having reviewed the pertinent passages I close this section with Fossum's summation of the significance of the placement of the Name in the Angel of the Lord:

When God promises to send his angel carrying his own Name in order to guide Israel to the land he has appointed for them, this means that he has put his power into the angel and thus will be with his people through the agency of the angel. The Angel of the Lord is an extension of YHWH's personality, because the proper Name of God signifies the divine nature. Thus, the Angel of the Lord has full divine authority by virtue of possessing God's Name: he has the power to withhold the absolution of sins.³⁵⁴

³⁴⁹ Peter Schäfer, *Rivalität Zwischen Engeln und Menschen. Untersuchungen zur Rabbinischen Engelvorstellung*, (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1975), 29.

³⁵⁰ Segal correctly states that, "Thus, it seems very likely that, by the beginning of the second century and back into the first century as well, there existed apocalyptic speculations about the name of God as a mediator in creation which probably was very early connected with the idea that this mediation could also be portrayed by a principal angel." See Alan Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977), 197. Also, Bousset believed that this tradition demonstrated that the Name was here already conceived of as hypostatic-like in nature. See Wilhelm D. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im Späthellenistischen Zeitalter 4th ed.*, ed. Hugo Gressmann, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966), 349.

³⁵¹ So Giesebrecht, *DATSGN*, 45 and Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 255.

³⁵² The import of this emplacement of the Name has drawn various responses from scholars. For Boehmer the emplacement of the Name signifies that the angel has the true perfect nature of God placed in him and that he is, in essence, the same as God. For Jacob's part he makes the unwarranted, but quite interesting reading, that the מלאך is one and the same with Joshua-i.e., he is not an angelic being! Jacob comes to this conclusion by assuming that the name that is in him, which is God's name, is really יהושע. Jacob points out that Joshua's original name, viz. הושע (Num. 13:16), was changed by the addition of יהוה. Accordingly, Jacob conflates the Angel with Joshua. See Boehmer, *BIN*, 31 and Jacob, *ING*, 23.

³⁵³ Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 255.

³⁵⁴ Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 86. See also Joseph Barbel, *Christos Angelos: Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des*

My last text is I Sam. 17:41-46. Here David stands against Goliath in the name of the Lord. The text reads:

Then the Philistine came on and approached David, with the shield-bearer in front of him. 42 When the Philistine looked and saw David, he disdained him; for he was *but* a youth, and ruddy, with a handsome appearance. 43 And the Philistine said to David, "Am I a dog, that you come to me with sticks?" And the Philistine cursed David by his gods. 44 The Philistine also said to David, "Come to me, and I will give your flesh to the birds of the sky and the beasts of the field." 45 Then David said to the Philistine, "You come to me with a sword, a spear, and a javelin, *but I come to you in the name of the LORD of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel* [emphasis mine], whom you have taunted. 46 "This day the LORD will deliver you up into my hands, and I will strike you down and remove your head from you. And I will give the dead bodies of the army of the Philistines this day to the birds of the sky and the wild beasts of the earth, that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel.

Here the Name is apparently depicted as a protective agent capable of being employed as a weapon in defense of David in his encounter with Goliath (cf. II Chron. 14:10).³⁵⁵ This passage understandably helped foster the notion that the Name was laden with power.³⁵⁶ Together with the prohibition against taking God's name in vein, these passages triggered the belief in the numinous power of the name of God. With these five texts in hand I shall now turn my attention to a thematic review of the name-concept in the Old Testament.

christlichen Altertums. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Ursprungs und der Fortdauer des Arianismus, (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1941), 22.

³⁵⁵So Boehmer, *BIN*, 54-55 and Brongers, "Die Wendung b'sēm jhwh," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* V.77 nu. 1 (1965): 2-3. In contrast, Nägelsbach notes that while David did proceed against Goliath with the name of God, at the decisive moment in the confrontation David relied on his sling and not the Name. One may question however, as to whether the Name was at least seen as the guarantor of the success of this enterprise. For Nägelsbach's views see *DNGJHS*, 25-26.

³⁵⁶ *II Edras* 1:16-17 possibly paints a similar picture when God complains against His people that they "...triumphed not in my name for the destruction of your enemies..." Still, this passage may just signify that the name of God serves as a symbol for, who or what, someone fights for.

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN THE REST OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

One of the most prominent categories of name-speculation is found in the claim that God had chosen a place for His Name to dwell, or that a sanctuary was built in order to house the Name. This belief is attested some 23 times.³⁵⁷ Moreover, at least the rudiments of this sort of theologoumenon appear to reach back into ancient Egypt (1500 B.C.E.).³⁵⁸

Of further interest here is that only in Judaism is the name of a deity claimed to have been placed (not simply invoked) in a particular cultic site.³⁵⁹ Perhaps this helps explain the inordinately great role that the Name came to play within Jewish cultus.³⁶⁰ One possible basis for this emphasis upon the Name may stem from the fact that in Jewish cultus there were no idols, or figures. This means that functionally speaking the representation of the deity in Judaism was served by the Name, an altogether rather stark difference to pagan cultus, which employed material objects to represent the presence of the deity.³⁶¹ We can see here that the earlier observation concerning how the Name functions as a signifier of the presence of YHWH developed by dint of this prohibition concerning other forms of symbolization (i.e., idols and images).³⁶² Another aspect was that cultic sites were places in which God had 'caused' His name to be remembered. Such commemoration was intended, in part, to call into remembrance the mighty deeds of YHWH.³⁶³

³⁵⁷E.g. Deut. 12:5, 11, 21; 14: 23; 16: 2, 6, 11; 26:2; II Sam. 7:13; I Ki. 3:2; 5:17, 19; 8:16-20 (=II Ch. 6:5-10); 8:44 (=II Ch. 6:34); 8:48 (=II Ch. 6:38); 9:7 (II Chron. 7:20); I Chron. 22:7,8,10,19; 28:3; 29:16; II Chron. 1:18; 2:3; 6:20; Neh. 1:9. If one excludes the building of altars and the like to the Name the number is 23 times according to Boehmer, *BIN*, 4.

³⁵⁸Jacob cites several examples of similar phraseology in earlier Near Eastern religions. See, *ING*, 45.

³⁵⁹So Grether, *NWGAT*, 42. Bietenhard is possessed of a similar conviction. See "ὄνομα," 255. Giesebrecht is also disposed to this view, *DATSGN*, 121. Examples of this phenomenon are found, *inter alia*, Dt. 12:5, 11; 14:23; 16: 2, 6, 11; 26:2; Neh. 1:9; II Ch. 6:20; I Ki. 9:3; 11:36; 14:21; II Ki. 21:4, 7 (=II Ch. 33:7); Ps. 74:7. This theologoumenon persisted into the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, e.g. Jdt 9:7-8, "...they intend to defile your sanctuary, and to pollute the tabernacle where your glorious Name resides...." See also Josephus, *AJ* 8, 108. In tandem with this theologoumenon, the Temple was the place where the Name was to be invoked. See I Esd 6:33.

³⁶⁰Grether goes so far as to claim that the name of God played a greater role in Judaism than in any other religion of its neighbors during this same time. See, *NWGAT*, 42-43.

³⁶¹Grether, *NWGAT*, 34.

³⁶²*Ibid.*, 31-32.

³⁶³Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 112.

All of the foregoing raises the question as to whether the Deuteronomist actually envisioned the Name as a hypostatic-like entity. While it is not the task of this work to deal with this issue (indeed the subject is so complex and broad that a full dissertation or monograph would be needed to treat it comprehensively), what we can say is that whatever the conception of the original writer, the popular view of the people was presumably that the Name did indeed dwell within the cultic site.³⁶⁴ Additionally, the placing of the Name in the Angel of the Lord does provide some evidence that at least some authors, and no doubt later authors, believed that the Name could be in some sense localized.³⁶⁵ A further buttress is found in the fact that during this stage of Jewish religion anthropomorphic thought abounded³⁶⁶ and the abstract theological reflection that God's Name dwelt in the Temple was a suitable correction to the notion that God Himself, was within the Temple. By the time of the Intertestamental Era it would also seem probable that a great many people felt that the Temple literally housed the Name.

Over and above the question of the hypostatization of the divine Name it can be said that something approaching consensus exists with respect to seeing in the *Namensetzen* formula the concern to insure the presence of YHWH in the cultic site. In line with the numerous references to choosing a particular site it is now generally supposed that the formula was utilized to designate one site in the preference to another.³⁶⁷

Certainly, the Name played a prominent role in the carrying out of cultus.³⁶⁸ For example, as the place where God's Name dwells the Temple is the place where God will hear the prayers of His people. An interesting interchange of this idea is found in I Kings (8:29, 44-45, 48-49; 9:3), where Solomon and God discuss the viewpoint that God's Name dwelt there:

³⁶⁴I agree here with Stade that this is probable. See Bernhard Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel II, Allgemeine geschichte in einzeldarstellungen*, ed. Wilhelm Oncken (Berlin: G. Grote, 1887-1888), 247. Moreover, Weippert indicates that other scriptures, such as Ps. 74:7, seem to clearly reflect the view that the Temple was believed to house the Name. See, "Der Ort, den Jahwe erwählen wird, um dort seinen Namen wohnen zu lassen: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Formel," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 24.1 (1980): 78 fn. 6.

³⁶⁵Gustav Westphal, *Jahwes Wohnstätten nach den Anschauungen der alten Hebräer: Eine alttestamentliche Untersuchung* (Gießen: Von Alfred Töpelmann, 1908), 192.

³⁶⁶So Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 191.

³⁶⁷McBride, *The Deuteronomistic Name Theology*, 52.

³⁶⁸See Giesebrecht, *DATSGN*, 33.

...that your eyes may be open night and day toward this house, the place of which you said, 'My Name shall be there,' that you may heed the prayer that your servant prays toward this place...and the city that you have chosen and the house that I have built for your Name,³⁶⁹ The LORD said to him, '...I have consecrated this house that you have built, and put my Name there forever...'

In a very interesting assessment of these verses, Goodenough states that these verses demonstrate that the Shekinah which was supposed to rest between the cherubim on the Ark-the very throne of YHWH³⁶⁹-is actually a surrogate for the Name.³⁷⁰ Moreover, the related phenomenological activity of the building of an altar for the Name, as Elijah was reported to have done (I Kings 18:30-32), intimates this also. Here the meaning is clear-the Name signifies that this altar is sanctified for the execution of proper cultus.³⁷¹ The altar is dedicated to the cult of YHWH and these cultic activities are carried out in His Name. Because they are executed in His Name the devotee can be sure that God will answer him.

A related function of the name-conception, and one that we have already encountered, involved the Name in theophanic contexts suggestive that it functions as the medium of the *Deus revelatus*.³⁷² That a divine intersection was believed to exist where God and man came together through the combination of place and the invoking of the Name can be seen from Gen 28:17, where Jacob states after his dream, "This is no other than the House of God, and this is the gate of heaven."

Beyond the obvious cultic aspects a further prominent theme with respect to the Name is the thought of doing something for the sake of the Name (למען שם). This expression occurs approximately 16 times.³⁷³ Here the primary thought is to perform or carry out some action that

³⁶⁹So Ben C. Ollenburger, *Zion, city of the great king: a theological symbol of the Jerusalem cult* (Sheffield: J.S.O.T. Press, 1987), 42.

³⁷⁰See E.R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period, Vol. II* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1953), 241.

³⁷¹That is, it legitimates the site. Nägelsbach's opinion is that the reference to the Name is only "worin die Vorgänge zu betrachten sind." See *DNGJHS*, 25.

³⁷²Ps. 20:6,8; 44:6; 118: 10-12; 124:8.

³⁷³So Boehmer, *BIN*, 3.

is meant to bestow honor and glory to the name of God.³⁷⁴ It is little wonder given the sanctity of the Name that this expression occurs only with reference to the divine name.³⁷⁵

For example, God displays mercy in the face of sin for the sake of His Name (Jer. 14:7; Eze. 20: 8-9, 13-14, 22, 44; cf. I Sam. 12:22), exercises forbearance (Isa. 48:9), brings salvation (Ps. 106:8), and forgives trespasses (here the petitioner asks God to act for His name's sake, see Ps. 25:11; 79:9).

The concept that the name of God and His reputation or image are bound together is made transparent in verses such as I Ki. 8:42-43, where it states with respect to pagan nations and the Name:

Also concerning the foreigner who is not of Thy people Israel, when he comes from a far country for Your name's sake for they will hear of Your great name and Your mighty hand, and of Your outstretched arm; when he comes and prays toward this house, 43 hear Thou in heaven Your dwelling place, and do according to all for which the foreigner calls to You, in order that all the peoples of the earth may know Your name, to fear Thee, as do Your people Israel, and that they may know that this house which I have built is called by Your name.³⁷⁶

Even those who petition God for mercy are actually appealing to God to deal with them mercifully for the sake of His Name (Ps. 109:21); indeed, forgiveness is anticipated, for God will act for His name's sake (Ps. 79:9).

There are numerous other noteworthy references to the Name which do not readily fall into any neat categories. For these cases it is perhaps best simply to flag them. To that end then I note the following. The Name is said to have gold and silver brought to it (Isa. 60:9). The people

³⁷⁴Pace Jacob and McBride, correctly Westphal. I cannot agree with Jacob's claim that the phrase means simply to act in a fashion that is commensurate with the Name—an explanation that I presume means that one is to behave in a manner which is as elevated as the Name itself. A similar explanation is attached to the phrase by McBride who believes that the phrase means to act "according to revealed or essential nature." However, this nuance does not take into account the highly proactive nature of the various actions taken by God which seem to indicate a robust effort to keep the Name from falling into disrepute and to create a place of respect and honor for it. That the name of a person (e.g., II Chron. 26:8; 26:15; Gen. 12:2; II Sam 7:9; Jos. 7:9), or of God (e.g., I Sam. 12:22) is connected to their reputations is made quite clear in the Old Testament. Indeed, in many of the references above in the New American Standard translation the word 'name' is translated by 'fame.' Accordingly, I part company with McBride and Jacob. See Jacob, *ING*, 16; McBride, *The Deuteronomic Name Theology*, 69 and Gustav Westphal, *Jahwes Wohnstätten*, 194.

³⁷⁵Jacob, *ING*, 17. Mehlmann has also noted that when God acts on behalf of his Name it can be in the sense of underscoring a divine property or characteristic. See Mehlmann, *Der "Name" Gottes im Alten Testament*, 46-47.

³⁷⁶Cf. also II Chron. 6:32; Isa. 52:6; Jer. 16:21.

shall be assembled in Jerusalem for the Name (Jer. 3:17). In a passage which we shall come across again, Mal. 1:11, we find the claim that everywhere offerings are directed to the Name. It may be of some passing interest that these passages all employ **לשם** rather than **בשם**.

Two final categories in which the Name appears is in those sometimes curious places where the Name is featured as a particularizing manifestation (or as Grether calls it a “Erscheinungsform”)³⁷⁷ of God Himself, or in those places where the Name is no longer depicted as being restrained to a single place, but to the contrary, is conceived of as being everywhere, or used as a symbol for the universal glory of God. I will review the former category first.

A number of passages are worthy of note. The first is Isa. 30:27, where the Name is spoken of in the following terms:

See, the name of the Lord comes from far away,
burning with his anger, and in thick rising smoke;
his lips are full of indignation,
and his tongue is like a devouring fire...³⁷⁸

Another conspicuous place where the Name is depicted as a particularizing manifestation is Prov. 18:10 which reads, “The name of the LORD is a strong tower; the righteous run to it and are safe.” Another text along similar lines is Ps. 54:3, which reads, “Save me, O God, by your name; vindicate me by your might” Here it is noteworthy that a *parallelismus membrorum* exists between the first member, i.e. “Save me, O God, by your name,” and the second member “Vindicate me by your might.” Clearly God’s might or power is made synonymous with His name. Other passages display a similar view, as Ps. 20:1 shows, “May the LORD answer you in the day of trouble! May the name of the God of Jacob set you securely on high!”³⁷⁹ In a similar vein the author of Ps. 44:6 states that in war, “Through you we push back our enemies; through your name we trample our foes.” All of this is reminiscent of David’s claim that when he faced

³⁷⁷ Grether, *NWGAT*, 30. Although Grether still labels the Name as a hypostasis due to these verses. See pg. 44f.

³⁷⁸ While I do not accept that this passage actually conveys the idea that the name of God is some sort of hypostasis there are dissenting opinions on this. To cite but one example, Schmidt believes that this passage does in fact support the notion that the Name is a hypostasis. See Hans Schmidt, “Namenglauben im AT,” in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart Vol.4*, eds. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnach, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1913), 660.

³⁷⁹ Other passages are Ps. 33:21, 52:11, 124:8. Mettinger maintains that such passages support the notion that Ancient Judaism believed in the Name as a sort of hypostatic entity. See *Dethronment*, 130.

Goliath he came against him "...in the name of the LORD Almighty, the God of the armies of Israel."

Still other texts speak of the Name as existing in power (Jer.10:6), a force which is believed to be the source of help for His people as Ps. 124:8 states, "Our help is in the name of the LORD, the Maker of heaven and earth."³⁸⁰ When we turn to the LXX we find the interesting inclusion in Numbers 14:20-21, where the name is said to be alive. The passage reads:

καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν "Ιλεως αὐτοῖς εἰμι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα σου, ²¹ ἀλλὰ ζῶ ἐγὼ καὶ ζῶν τὸ ὄνομα μου καὶ ἐμπλήσει ἡ δόξα κυρίου πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν,

All of these passages may betray the possibility that the Name was viewed in some circles as the earthly power of YHWH.

As for other categories, such as those which universalize the Name, there are texts such as Ps. 8:2, 10, which declare that God's Name is glorious in the entire world.

And the final, and in some sense the most important function which the Name plays, is in securing salvation for those who call upon it. The foundational passage is the oft-cited Joel 2:30-32 where we read that:

And I will display wonders in the sky and on the earth, Blood, fire, and columns of smoke. 31 "The sun will be turned into darkness, And the moon into blood, Before the great and awesome day of the LORD comes. 32 "And it will come about that whoever calls on the name of the LORD will be delivered." (cf. Ps. 54:1 and reads, "Save me, O God, by your name, and vindicate me by your might" and Ps. 91: 14-15 "But I call upon God, and the LORD will save me, I will protect those who know my name).

The passage has served as the foundation for later Christian speculation on the import of the Day of Pentecost and the reception of the Spirit. In addition, several other particulars should be pointed out.

The first aspect to be noted is that those who invoke the name of YHWH will be saved- but this only prompts the question of just what it is that YHWH will save them from. Our clue is found in the verb that the author employs here, which is *málat*. This usage here is quite suggestive of how the author sees the Day of the Lord. The verb connotes escape to safety from a concrete physical event. This connotation differs markedly from the meaning of the cognate verb

³⁸⁰ Here we must follow Delling and agree that the passage means to say that YHWH is their help. See Gerhard Delling, *Die Zueignung des Heils in der Taufe. Eine Untersuchung zum neutestamentlichen „taufen auf den Namen“* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), 21.

yāša', a verb which can convey the meaning of salvation in the spiritual sense.³⁸¹ Insofar as the author has chosen to use *mālat* it is clear that he sees this salvation as that of escaping the very real and terrible wrath of God which will visit mankind on the day of His visitation. For the author it is clear that only those who invoke the name of YHWH will find themselves protected from this eschatological wrath.

The author also gives a complementary conception in that this salvation is reserved for those whom the Lord has called (2:32). Of further significance is that this salvation is accomplished through the Spirit of the Lord,³⁸² in keeping with the promises for this day of salvation where the promise is for the bestowal of the Spirit upon Israel (2:28). With this review in hand I shall now review the name-concept as it is found in non-canonical sources.

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN NON-CANONICAL SOURCES

I begin my review with that most extraordinary of documents, *I Enoch*. In the Similitudes of I Enoch the Name plays an inordinately pivotal position in the author's *Heilsgeschichte*. The author has Enoch begin one of his first discourses with the following engrossing description concerning the beginning of his divine indoctrination into the mysteries of the Lord of Spirits (39:9). Enoch says, "In those days, I praised and prayed to the Name of the Lord of Spirits with blessings and praises..." Enoch in effect was doing nothing other than following the lead of the angels in the court of God, who are described as, "blessing the Name of the Lord of Spirits" (40: 5), and, "supplicating in the name of the Lord of Spirits" (40: 6).

The author progresses further within the realm of the name-concept in his narrative when he declares that the believers are those who believe on, and appeal to, the name of the Lord of the Spirits (43:4; 45: 3). Indeed, in the eschaton all the nations shall fall prostrate and sing the name of the Lord of the Spirits (48:6). In addition, the righteous shall be saved in His Name (48:7; 50:3b), while the ungodly cannot believe in His name (67:9). For believers, it was the good pleasure of the Lord of Spirits that they might have life (48:8). In that Day the elect will glorify, praise, and bless the name of the Lord of Spirits (47:2). Indeed, that Day will see the Elect One reign in the name of the Lord of Spirits (55:4). Through the Name the righteous person (50:2; 53:7) shall be made victorious, while the wicked will deny, and refuse to extol (46:6), the

³⁸¹ So A.M. Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 135-136.

³⁸² *Ibid.*, 138.

name of the Lord of Spirits (38: 2; 46:8), which is the cause for their destruction (41:2; 45:1,2; 46:7).

As for the Son of Man he is said to have been given a name by the Lord of Spirits while standing in his presence before the creation of the world (48:2-4; cf. Phil 2:9). The Son of Man will be the hope of the nations, as well as be victorious (50: 2), in this name (48: 7; 50:3), for which cause they glorify, bless, and sing the name of the Lord of Spirits (48: 5). Furthermore, the people praise and bless Him because the name of the Son of Man is revealed to them (69: 27). Upon review it is obvious that all of these texts bear witness to the important role that divine names played within the conventicle that produced this fascinating document. Clearly, I Enoch displays several remarkable characteristics which find ready parallels to New Testament conceptions. Later, in my section on the New Testament we shall run across I Enoch again.

Moving on to other intertestamental texts we find that names could also be symbolic of majesty so profound that they were prohibited from being divulged. In *Joseph and Aseneth* 15:12, in a passage more than tangentially touched by Judges 13:18, Aseneth receives a visitation from an archangel, possibly Michael or the Angel of the Lord, whom Aseneth then implores to reveal his name:

And when the man finished speaking these words, Aseneth rejoiced exceedingly with great joy about all these words and fell down at his feet and prostrated herself face down to the ground before him, and said to him, 'Blessed be the Lord your God the Most High...and blessed be your name forever. What is your name, Lord tell me in order that I may praise and glorify you forever and forever.' And the man said to her, 'Why do you seek this, my name, Aseneth? My name is in the heavens in the Book of the Most High, written by the finger of God in the beginning of the book before all the others, because I am the chief of the house of the Most High. And all names written in the book of the Most High are unspeakable, and man is not allowed to pronounce nor hear them in this world, because those names are exceedingly great and wonderful and laudable.'

Another name related aspect comes from texts which show some reflection upon the apotropaic role of the divine Name, as for example the First Century C.E. Jewish *Prayer of Manasseh* (1:1-3),³⁸³ where the hymnodist believes that the Name keeps the domain of the demons sealed:

O Lord, God of our fathers,

³⁸³For pertinent documentation concerning date and provenance see James Charlesworth, "Prayer of Manasseh," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha V.2*, ed. James Charlesworth (Garden City: Double Day, 1983-1985), 627-628.

God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their righteous offspring;
 He who made the heavens and the earth with all their beauty;
 He who bound the sea and established it,
 by the command of his word,
 he who closed the bottomless pit
 and sealed it by his glorious and powerful Name.

Turning to the DSS we find that the covenanters of Qumran also entertained some aspects of the name-concept. To be sure the name-concept is more diffuse in the Qumran texts and in general it clears no new trails, but notwithstanding their close adherence to normative Old Testament boundaries some facets of the name-concept stand out. I shall point out these singularities at the end of my DSS review.

Now not unlike injunctions in the Old Testament, members were to praise and glorify (and/or extol, exult, and celebrate) the Name (*1QH IX-30, XI-23, XIX-24, XX-3; 1Q28^b col. IV l. 28; 1Q34+34^{bis} Frag. 3 col. I, l. 6; IQM XIV l. 12; 4Q242 Frags. 1-3 l. 5; 4Q427 l. 6; 4Q511 Frag. 2 col. I l. 1; 4Q416 Frag. 2 col. III l. 11; 4Q418 Frag. 126 col. II l. 10; 4Q503 Frags. 29-32 col. VIII l. 9, Frags. 40-41 l. 2; 4Q511 Frag. 35 l. 6*),³⁸⁴ and were enjoined to cherish and love the Name (*11QPs^a Syriac Psalm III-XIX; 1QH XVI*), as well as sanctify it (*4Q427 Frag. 7 col. I l. 15-16; cf. 4Q177 col. IV l. 15*). The community also reflect upon God's name (*CD XX l. 19-20*), celebrate it (*1Q34+34^{bis} Frag. 3 col. I, l. 6; 4Q508 Frag. 1 l. 2*), and bless it (*IQM col. XIII l. 7, col. XVIII l. 7; 1QH col. IV, l. 20, col. XI l. 30, col. XIX l. 6, Frag. 4 l. 17; 4Q 504 frags. 1-2 col. VII l. 4-5; 4Q503 Frags. 7-9 l. 3, Frags. 13-16 l. 4; 11QH l. 4*). They do this for this is the very action for which they were created (*4Q508 Frag. 1 l. 2*), and which they are obliged to do for YHWH commands them to do so (*4Q370 col. II l. 1-2*). The community believes that the Name is worthy of such encomium for the Name is holy, great, and eternal (*4Q202 col. III l. 16; 4Q504 frags. 1-2 col. VII l. 4-5, Frag. 3 col. II l. 10, Frag. 4 l. 16, Frag. 5 col. I l. 3*). These beliefs could lead the hymnodist responsible for 11Q (*11Q380, Frag. 1 col. I, l. 7*) to muse, "Who is worthy to utter the Name"?

Such respect for the Name was not without its reward, for according to the hymnodist of the Apocryphal psalms YHWH listens to, and protects, the covenanters *because* they love His

³⁸⁴ All citations and their respective siglas, whenever possible, are taken from the volumes of *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, eds. Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude, (Oxford : Clarendon, 1955-2001). Some texts that are not yet published in the *DJD* are taken from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea scrolls study edition*, (Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1997-1998).

name (*11QPsalms*^a [*11Q5*] col. XIX l. 6, 12; *11QPs*^b [*11Q6*] Frag. a. l. 6; cf. *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*^a [*4Q385*] Frag. 2 l. 2, *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*^b col. I l. 1). The covenanters who called upon the Name (*4Q504* col. III l. 4) viewed the Name as a source of strength for themselves (*1Q28*^b col. V l. 28; *4QD*^b Frag. 4 l. 2; *4QD*^d [*4Q269*] Frag. 4 col. II l. 1-2; and quite probably *1QH* col. XXIII l. 8), just as David had done centuries before in his combat with Goliath (*1QM* col. XI l. 2).³⁸⁵

Quite significantly the community sought refuge in the Name for they believed that it would bring about their salvation (*4Q381*, Frag. 24 l. 7; cf. *CD* col. XX l. 34; *4QD*^b [*4Q267*] Frag. 6 col. I l. 7). All the while the covenanters are rendering thanks to His Name (as suggested by *4Q504* col. VII l. 4-5).

In parallel to those Old Testament passages which speak of housing the Name in a special locality, the community believed that the Temple (and the chosen city) was where the Name would one day dwell (*11Q19* col. XXIX l. 3-4; *11Q19* col. XLVII l. 3-4; cf. col. LII l. 14-16, col. 9-10, col. LX l. 13-14; *4Q504* frags. 1-2 col. IV l. 1-4; *4Q529* l. 9). In point of fact this chosen place is where the community was to 'commemorate' God's name (*4Q158* Frags. 7-8 l. 7). In this context their claim to be the community which has the Name called over them (*4Q14* frag. 1, col. II, l. 15); indeed, even called by His name (*4Q418* Frag. 81 l. 12; *4Q504* col. II l. 12), signifies that they belong to YHWH and have been chosen by Him to be His faithful remnant. Furthermore, the Qumran community believed that the Holy City would always endure for the Name was invoked over it (*4Q380*, Frag. 1 col. I l. 2-5). Because they are the people of YHWH they invoke only His name (*4Q504*, frags. 1-2, col. III l. 4), and their use of the Name characterized the community as those who rely on the name of YHWH (*11Q11* col. II l. 7-10).

Where the covenanters part company with established Old Testament conceptions is in the area of demonology and eschatology. We find also that the Name was considered to be numinous (*1QH* col. XVII l. 39, and probably also col. XXIII l. 8). For example, as already noted, the covenanters believe that the invocation of the Name produced apotropaic and numinous effects, e.g. it could expel demonic forces (*11Q11* [*11QPsAp*^a] col. V l. 2-4). Moreover, the

³⁸⁵ I have already mentioned that Nägelsbach denies that the Name is seen as a numinous source in the original narrative. Whatever one may say about the original narrative, it is clear that the Qumran community believed that it was the power in the Name which made David victorious.

Qumran tradents also record their belief that they possessed a spell to cast out demons in the name of YHWH (ויקרא בשם, 11Q11 [11QPsAp^a] col. III l. 2-5).³⁸⁶

This emphasis upon the apotropaic quality of divine names may be responsible for the curiously excessive preoccupation with the names of the angelic host that evidently existed at Qumran.³⁸⁷ As Josephus relates about the prescriptions placed upon the Essene initiate:

He is made to swear tremendous oaths: First that he will practice piety toward the deity...that he will wrong none whether of his own mind or that of another; to conceal nothing from the sect and to report none of their secrets to others, even though tortured to death...and in like manner carefully to preserve the books of the sect and the names of the angels (τά τε τῆς αἱρέσεως αὐτῶν βιβλία καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ὀνόματα).³⁸⁸

Beyond this it must be said that the preceding context of this passage in Josephus, which speaks of the Essenes dabbling in ancient roots and other speculations, seems to lend some credence to this hypothesis.³⁸⁹ Yet another passage that leans in this direction is 11Q11 col. II l. 1-4, which intimates that Solomon's name may have been invoked in apotropaic rituals.

Whatever the case may be with respect to angelic names, other aspects need to be highlighted. For example, within the community the hymnodist who wrote the Hodayoth could speak of the Name as the agency that created spiritual light for the covenanters (1QH col. XVII l. 26).

As for Qumran eschatology they posited that in the final age all the nations would offer sacrifices to the Name (4Q504 frags. 1-2, col. III, l. 9-11). And the author of the Temple Scroll, in an important cultic setting, mandates that in the final eschaton the people of God can only

³⁸⁶As cited in E. Puech, "11QPsAp: Un Rituel D'Exorcismes. Essai de Reconstruction," *Revue de Qumran* 14 No.55 (1990): 377-408.

³⁸⁷This sort of apotropaic speculation is also clearly reflected in *Test. Levi* 5:5, where Levi states to His protective angel, "I beg you Lord, teach me your name, so that I may call on you in the day of tribulation." Here, without doubt, the angels were thought to offer physical protection and could be called into the fray by calling out their name. Another example is found in Arnobius' *Adversus Gentes* (sometimes referred to as *adversus Nationes*), 1.43, where Jesus' powers are imputed to derive from Jesus' knowledge of the names of powerful angels. The text reads, "He [Jesus] effected all these things by secret arts. From the shrines of the Egyptians He stole the names of angels of might, and the religious system of a remote country."

³⁸⁸*Bellum Judaicum*, 2.142.

³⁸⁹Arnold, *Colossian Syncretism*, 34. This sort of speculation fits well with the sort of magical conception of divine names found in Greco-Roman conventicles.

sacrifice where the Name shall dwell (*11Q19, col. LIII. 9-10*). Furthermore, God, it is said, will make His name known in that time (*4Q542 col. 11.1*)

As for other Jewish sources we find that the Name of YHWH was imputed to have had a mediating role in creation. This is attested to in various texts. In *Jubilees* 36.7, the author Isaac is said to desire that Jacob and Esau take an oath to always fear and worship God. This oath has the most powerful binding power of all oaths for it is taken, "...by the glorious and honored and great and splendid and amazing and mighty Name which made heaven and earth and everything together."³⁹⁰

This mediating role is also found in *I Enoch* where the text states that "the secret Name enunciated in the Oath" (LXIX, 14) is the selfsame oath whereby, "the heavens were suspended before the world was created...By this oath the deeps were established" (LXIX, 16-19). We find that the Oath is said to be, "established in power over the spirits" (LXIX, 25). What should not be left unnoticed is that it is the invocation of the secret Name that empowers and enfranchises the Oath to effect these works.³⁹¹

We also find traces of this sort of belief in later Jewish texts. For example, a similar sentiment is also expressed in *Targum Yerushalmi I Ex. 28:30*, where the Targumist (or the meturgeman) alleges that the Urim and Thummim had the divine Name inscribed upon them, the Name which the text maintains had created the three hundred and ten worlds.³⁹² Unfortunately this Targum has an eclectic mixture of traditions and it is difficult to separate the traditions temporally.³⁹³ Nevertheless, for this Targumist it is the Name that is the medium through which God has created the cosmos and it is the Name that governs the spiritual realm. In similar fashion we find this same belief in the admittedly late Hekhalot literature. In *Hekhaloth Rabbati* 9 we

³⁹⁰ Among Samaritan documents, Memar Marqah records a similar view at I.4.

³⁹¹ As Philo notes it is the divine name which confirms an oath. *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*. 28.93.

³⁹² The tradition that the divine names were inscribed upon the Urim and Thummim is otherwise unattested. However, the belief that 310 original worlds were created is found as early as *m. Uktzin* 3:12. It is also mentioned in *b. Sanh.* 100a.

³⁹³ Craig A. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody Mass.: Hendrickson, 1992), 100.

read, "Great is the Name through which heaven and earth have been created."³⁹⁴ This theologoumenon continues in texts such as III Enoch (13.1; 44.1), where we read, "He wrote with His finger with a flaming style upon the crown of my head the letters [which form the name YHWH] by which were created heaven and earth," and, "Come and behold the letters by which the heaven and the earth were created."

Coming back to the first century we find that the Jewish historian Josephus also affiliates himself with the name-concept in three rather marked passages. In the first text, Josephus passes on an apocryphal anecdote concerning the arrival of Alexander the Great into Jerusalem. According to Josephus, when the high priests were appraised that Alexander had drawn near unto the city they came out in considerable servility in order to stave off Alexander's well known proclivity for rapacious behavior. Josephus narrates that as Alexander and his entourage approached he saw:

The multitude in white garments the priests at their head, and the high priest...wearing on his head the mitre with the golden plate on it on which was inscribed the Name of God (ἐγγέγραπτο ὄνομα), he approached alone [i.e. Alexander] and prostrated himself (προσεκύνησε) before the Name (τὸ ὄνομα)...Then all the Jews together greeted Alexander with one voice and surrounded him, but the king of Syria and the others were amazed at his action thinking he was deranged...And [when] asked why, when all men had prostrated themselves before him he had prostrated himself before the high priest of the Jews, whereupon he replied, 'It was not before him that I prostrated myself but the God (τὸν Θεόν) of whom he has the honor to be high priest.' (AJ XI.331-333).

Josephus' use of language here is most telling. First, the Greek verb προσκύνειω can often connote worship. Josephus is presumably signifying true worship, for he is quite unmistakably signifying that YHWH was being acknowledged by Alexander as "the God" (τὸν Θεόν). Moreover, in the narrative Josephus has given us no other indication whereby the reader might apprehend just how it was that Alexander was cognizant of which god he was dealing with, or how preeminent He was, unless the Name conveyed this information. But how might this be so? Josephus' readers would presumably know that Alexander could not read Hebrew, nor could he have understood the Tetragrammaton to be the divine Name. Thus, how did the

³⁹⁴It should be observed that the power and meaning of the divine name is highly emphasized within the Hekalot literature on the whole. For further reading, consult Peter Schäfer, *Der verborgene und offenbar Gott: Hauptthemen der frühen jüdischen Mystik* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991), 48, 54-55, 68-70, 74-77, 92-97, 102-108, 121-122.

Name communicate this fact? One is left to surmise that Josephus would have his reader believe that the Name itself was numinous.

It is an interesting exercise to compare this tale with the Philonic understanding of this priestly diadem:

And a golden leaf was wrought like a crown, having four names [letters] engraved upon it which may only be mentioned or heard by holy men having their ears and their tongues purified by wisdom, and by no one else at all in any place whatsoever.... and above this cidaris is a golden leaf on which an engraving of four letters was impressed; by which letters they say that the Name of the living God is indicated, since it is not possible that anything in existence, should exist without God being invoked...³⁹⁵

Returning to Josephus we find in Josephus' second exposition on the divine name a narrative that tells his version of how Moses came into the possession of the divine name. According to Josephus Moses had seen such great miracles that he could no longer doubt that God was with him, or in his commissioning. Nevertheless, Moses sought confirmation for his call to confront Pharaoh with supernatural wonders. It is said that:

Moses...prayed and entreated that he might be vouchsafed this power in Egypt; he also besought Him not to deny him the knowledge of His Name...since...when sacrificing he might invoke Him by His Name to be present at the sacred rites. Then God revealed to him His Name, where ere [before] then had not to men's ears, and of which I am forbidden to speak. (*AJ* II.275-276)

Another apparent belief was that the Name could be used to carry out injurious acts (*AJ* 3.270-275). We see this in a free paraphrase of the prohibition found in Num. 5:12-28, where Josephus now adds the use of the divine name. With the addition of the divine name Josephus maintains that cases of adultery could now be adjudicated (more accurately?):

But if anyone suspect that his wife has been guilty of adultery, he was to bring a tenth deal of barley flour; they then cast one handful to God, and gave the rest of it to the priests for food. One of the priests set the woman at the gates that are turned towards the temple, and took the veil from her head, and wrote the name of God on parchment, and enjoined her to swear that she had not at all injured her husband; and to wish that, if she had violated her chastity, her right thigh might be put out of joint; that her belly might swell, and that she might die thus; but that if her husband, by the violence of his affection, and of the jealousy which arose from it, had been rashly moved to this suspicion, that she might bear a male child in the tenth month. Now when these oaths

³⁹⁵*De Vita Mosis*, II. 23.114 and 26.132. As an aside I note that in later tradition Metatron was evidently also given a crown with the Name engraved upon it. In *3 Enoch* 13.3 we read:

He wrote with His finger,...upon the crown which was on my head, the letters by which the heaven and the earth were created; the letters by which the seas and rivers were created; the letters by which mountains and hills were created; the letters by which stars and constellations, lighting and wind, thunder and thunderclaps were created....

were over, the priest wiped the name of God out of the parchment, and wrung the water into a vial. He also took some dust out of the temple (if any happened to be there), and put a little of it into the vial, and gave it her to drink; whereupon the woman, if she were unjustly accused, conceived with child, and brought it to perfection in her womb; but if she had broken her faith of wedlock to her husband, and had sworn falsely before God, she died in a reproachful manner; her thigh fell off from her, and her belly swelled with a dropsy. And these are the ceremonies about sacrifices, and about the purification's thereto belonging, which Moses provided for his countrymen.

As for other literary texts I have already noted in the section on Greco-Roman magic, but which bears repeating here, that the Jewish historian and epitomizer Artapanus narrates a tale in which Pharaoh had Moses thrown in a prison after Moses had brazenly demanded that his fellow kinsmen be released from bondage. Thereafter, in the midst of the night the prison doors were cast open and Moses proceeded to leave the prison and enter the sleeping chambers of Pharaoh. Upon being woken by Moses, Pharaoh made jest of Moses and demanded that he reveal the name of the god who had abetted his escape. Straightaway Moses spoke the divine Name to Pharaoh with the concomitant result that Pharaoh fell unconscious. According to the narrative, Moses revived Pharaoh and subsequently wrote down the secret name of God upon a tablet. Thereafter, one of Pharaoh's priests, who is said to have disparaged the sacred Name, was immediately thrown into a convulsive fit that killed him.³⁹⁶ Even Justin in his *First Apology* 61 claims concerning the Name that "no one can utter the Name of the ineffable God; and if anyone dare to say that there is a name, he raves with a hopeless madness."

Such speculations on the power of the divine name are by no means restricted to the pseudepigraphical, or historical literature. They are found both in rabbinic, as well as Samaritan literature. I shall reserve my review of some Rabbinic concepts for appendix six. With that said, I shall review the name-concept in Jewish magic.

³⁹⁶As quoted in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* 9.27,24. As an aside, it is interesting to note that Fossum, crediting an insight from S. Bartina, has rightly speculated that the narrative in Jn. 18: 6 refers to God's name being pronounced. In the narrative, Jesus replies to the Jewish guards who have come to arrest him and when asked if he is, "Jesus of Nazareth," he replies, "I am." Most scholars see here a reference to various Deutero-Isaiah passages where God refers to Himself as אֲנִי הוּא (e.g. Isa. 43:25; 51:12). Now in the Johannine passage, when Jesus replies, "I am," the guards fell down to the ground. The reaction of the guards implies that the divine name was spoken out. Within Judaism, we find several examples where at the pronounciation of the Name a profound effect was generated and this seems to fit quite well the reaction of the guards. This would imply then, that Jesus was claiming the divine name for himself. See Fossum, "In the Beginning was the Name," 127.

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN JEWISH MAGIC

During the Intertestamental period Jewish interests turned increasingly toward a preoccupation with the demonic, and in many respects magic. This inordinate interest garnered for them a number of pejorative epithets. Juvenal, in his *Satires* (6.546), accuses the Jews of being unscrupulous in the manner in which they plied their exorcistic and magical trade. In the following Juvenal tells of an encounter with a Jewish prophetess:

No sooner has that fellow departed than a palsied Jewess, leaving her basket and her truss of hay, comes begging in her secret ear; she is an interpreter of the laws of Jerusalem, a high priestess of the tree, a trusty go between of the highest heaven. She, too, fills her palm, but more sparingly, for a Jew will tell you dreams of any kind you please for the minutest of coins.³⁹⁷

According to Celsus (*C. Cels.*, 1.26) the Jews are “addicted to sorcery which Moses first expounded to them.” Further, Lucian (ca. 160 C.E.) could complain of those “fools [who] fall for the spells of the Jews.”³⁹⁸ In fact, as early as Posidonius (ca. 135-150 B.C.E.) we encounter the complaint that “the (Jewish) people are sorcerers and pretend to use incantations.”³⁹⁹ In point of fact, magic came to play an increasingly important role in the syncretistic intermeshing of Jewish and Greek culture as E. Schwartz points out:

It must not be over-looked that Judaism derived publicity not only from its apologetic, properly so called, but also a more debased sort of publicity through practitioners of elements in the syncretism which underlies magic. They are really the most important and interesting elements in it.⁴⁰⁰

While one may wish to argue that pagan observers misunderstood Jewish exorcists to be magicians, in my view it seems likely that these itinerant exorcists would have incorporated some magical-type procedures, for example, an apparatus (e.g., the Seal of Solomon which is clearly an example of *materia magica*), in their exorcisms. All of these texts from contemporaneous non-Jewish authors attest to the fact, or at least the perception, that post-

³⁹⁷Translation from Stern, *Greek and Roman Authors on Jews*, 101. The original text reads: *Cum dedit ille locum, cophino fenoque relicto arcanum Iudaea tremens mendicat in aurem, interpres legum Solymarum et magna sacerdos arboris ac summi fida internuntia caeli. Implet et illa manum, sed parcus; aere minuto qualiacumque voles Judaei somnia vendunt.*

³⁹⁸ *Gout* 170.

³⁹⁹ Strabo in his *Geographica* 16.2.43. As quoted in Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 147.

⁴⁰⁰E. Schwartz, *Christliche und Jüdische Ostertafeln*, (Berlin: Abhandlung der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen. Phil. Hist. Klasse, Serie 8:6., 1905), 117. As quoted in Simon, *Verus Israel*, 341.

Biblical Judaism was becoming increasingly preoccupied with magic. Coupled with texts cited earlier, we can infer that Intertestamental Judaism was increasing taken with magical notions.

Shifting to non-literary magical sources of obvious Jewish provenance we encounter amulets that have been cataloged by Goodenough, among others.⁴⁰¹ Congruent with our examples culled from the *SHR* these amulets attest to the same reliance upon knowing and utilizing divine names. For example one amulet reads:

I summon thee, Gabriel, by the holy names of the Father, Marinab, Marmaru, Balam, Phiou, Bathuriel, Ioa, Sabaoth, Adonai, Pantokrator, Manuel, Sabaoth, Abathu....

And in another amulet we find inscribed the following supplication:

By virtue of the [power] of your holy Name, Iao, Sabaoth, Adonai, Elohi, the Pantokrator...great and only god,... send Gabriel to me, the angel of righteousness, that he may drive away before me all the impure spirits...

An even more telling fact which can be adduced for the centrality of the divine name in these magical reliquaries is the fact that through time, the basic form of both the amulet, and the pivotal position that the divine name plays, remains for all intents and purposes unchanged.⁴⁰²

Other examples from a demonstrably Semitic (almost certainly Jewish) provenance are provided for in various incantational texts. Although after the era of my concern, they nevertheless give us some idea of how Jews might have used divine names. In any case, several examples are particularly engaging. The first invokes various angels to provide healing:

This bowl is designated for the sealing of the house of Mihr-Hormizd bar Mami...In the name of Michael the healer, and Raphael the reliever, and Gabriel the servant of the Lord. Bound and sealed is all evil that is there in the body of Mihr Hormizd bar Mami...⁴⁰³

In yet another text we find the name of YHWH directly invoked:

Salvation and bound are all blast-demons and evil destructive demons...May the sorceries be turned back on those who worked them...in the name of YHWH YH Elohim שבת [shebeoth] amen, amen, selah...⁴⁰⁴

⁴⁰¹Edwin R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman period. Vol. I, II Bollingen Series* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1953-68).

⁴⁰²T. Schirrie, *Hebrew Amulets*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), 10. For examples which document this claim see especially the appendix, pgs. 139-148. For a general exposition on this stasis or stagnancy of magical techniques see Hull, *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition Synoptic*, 20-27.

⁴⁰³James A. Montgomery, *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*, Series, University of Pennsylvania, The Museum, Publication of the Babylonian Section, Vol. 3, (Philadelphia: The Museum, 1913), 34.

⁴⁰⁴As quoted in Geller. See Markham, J. Geller, "'Jesus' Theurgic Powers: Parallels in the Talmud and Incantation Bowls," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 28 (1977): 150.

Several Aramaic incantational texts from ca. 400 C.E. also tell in favor of this portrait of Jewish magic. Although I am stretching the bounds of my chronological envelope I, nevertheless, have just cause for consulting these texts for two valid reasons. First, the function and various forms of these incantations are highly analogous to earlier traditions and in fact appear to draw from them.⁴⁰⁵ Secondly, as a distinctive corpus derived exclusively from Aramaic sources, these texts allow us a window in which to view distinct traditional Semitic idioms that might otherwise go unnoted.

Given the breadth of the material in this collection I shall choose four representative samples, which I trust, will prove illustrative for my investigation. I shall withhold my analysis of these texts until all four have been presented.

Our first text comes from an amulet whose provenance is near Ağabeyli, Turkey.⁴⁰⁶ The incantation is apotropaic in nature and was intended to ward off evil spirits. A relevant portion of the charm reads as follows:

Put mercy from heaven on šlwnh. In the name (בשם) of Michael, Raphael, Azrael, Azriel, Ariel...the holy angels which stand in front of the throne of Great God. In your Name (בשםך) sacred God, may there be extinguished the evil spirit and the demon and the shadow spirit and the tormentor and the destroyer. In your Name ([ך]בשם) God of Israel, may the words rise up to the heaven, at the side of the throne of the great, powerful, awful, sacred, magnified, praised, and exalted God...For mercy in front of the throne [may] there be extinguished the tormentor, the destroyer and....the demon...

Our second text is also apotropaic in nature and seeks as its terminus a successful exorcism.⁴⁰⁷ The text reads:

[This amulet is for Shim'on son of Sappira against every...and Satan and evil eye and fever [...and every] spirit that shakes. In the Name (בשם) of the God of Israel Zairphthaò phozakh[ot][magic characters][...]el, God's divine Presence above my head...exorcise Satan...

⁴⁰⁵ Joseph Naveh and Shaul Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985), 30. The authors note that even in amulets and texts from the Cairo Genizah, the constituent elements of the incantations, inclusive of even orthography, are so similar to earlier incantations that in many cases consulting the Genizah corpora can restore a fragmentary earlier text.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid. For the pertinent scholium, as well as the full text consult pgs. 68-71.

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid., 102. The provenance of the text is unfortunately not known.

Our third text comes from an incantation bowl from Mesopotamia that evinces an interesting international flavor to its magic,⁴⁰⁸ but also an apotropaic cast. The text reads:

Overtured [repeated seven times] is the earth and heaven...Overtured is the curse...[of the ones] who stand...on the mountains and the temple and the synagogue. Bound and sealed is the curse which she made [?]. In the name (בִּישׁוּם) of Betiel and Yeputiel, and in the name of YYY the Great, the angel who has eleven names...Whoever transgress against these names, these angels, bound and sealed are all demons and evil spirits...⁴⁰⁹

My last group of examples comes from one amulet, one *lamella*, and one intaglio respectively. The amulet originated in Horvat Kanaf. The text reads:

An amulet to heal Ya'itha the daughter of Marian from the fever and the shiver and the evil eye....Yahu Yahu Yahu Yahu [magic signs] exorcise the fever from the body of Ya'itha...In the Name (בְּשֵׁם) of I-am-who-I-am.⁴¹⁰

This *lamella* carries the typical adjuration formula with a crude drawing of the Seal of Solomon,⁴¹¹ which encircles the Tetragrammaton.⁴¹² In a final example, the intaglio of the Pibechean exorcism admonishes the demon not to "disobey the Name of God."⁴¹³

⁴⁰⁸Ibid., 27. In the expression of 'ובית אילהי ובית כנישתא' (pg. 34) we seem to have reference to pagan temples, but also to a Jewish synagogue.

⁴⁰⁹For full access to the text see pg. 135 of Naheh and Shaked.

⁴¹⁰The use of an acceptable form of the Tetragrammaton is paralleled in an exorcistic text from the 12th century Cairo Genizah. The text reads, "In the Name of yy the God of Israel...In the name of the I-am-who-I-am...I adjure you spirit in the Name of the Tetragrammaton, who sits on the wings of the winds,...who sits on the clouds..." See Naveh and Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls*, 225-226.

⁴¹¹The Seal of Solomon was famous in antiquity for having the power to exorcize demons. According to Duling at least 12 references to the Seal have been found upon Aramaic incantation bowls. Interestingly, the Seal of Solomon, which is similar to the ring of Solomon, as Josephus makes clear, was believed by many Jews to carry the Tetragrammaton, and was credited with binding Amodai, the prince of demons (*Test. of Sol.* 1.6-7; *b. Git.* 68b). Further enlightenment can be found in Josephus. In *Ant.* 8.45 he relates concerning Solomon that "God gave him [Solomon] knowledge of the art that is used against demons, in order to heal and benefit men." Josephus appends the further comment that Solomon, being the greatest exorcist of all, had left explicit spells (ἐπιφράσεις) concerning the proper protocol for exercising authority over the demonic realm (τρόπους ἐξορκώσεων). As Duling notes the origin of this speculation probably is to be traced to I Kings 5:9-14, where Solomon is said to have stated 3,000 proverbs and 1,005 songs (5,000 in the LXX!), and 4:29-34, where it is said that Solomon's wisdom exceeded all the peoples of the east, including Egypt-the home of magic par excellence. This tradition is expanded upon in Josephus (*Ant.* 8.2.5.), where Josephus relates that Solomon had written books of parables and 1,005 books of ᾠδαί, as well as incantations. It is of some interest to take note also of Wisdom of Solomon 7:15-22; "For it is he that has given me unerring knowledge, to know the constitution of the world and the working of the elements... the powers of the spirits and the designs of men the varieties of plants and the virtues of roots, all that was secret or manifest I learned, For wisdom, the fashioner of all things, taught me." Perhaps of greater interest is that Josephus' statement presupposes a circulating magical text, a type of *Liber Sacra*, in his day. Such a book may lay behind the so-called 'Hygromancy of Solomon,' which possibly dates to the First Century C.E. It is of some interest to note that such a text may very well have instructed the practitioner to apply the name of Solomon as the source of authority in the exorcism. Further corroboration for this idea is found in the fact that at Qumran the covenanters added the name of Solomon to Psalm 91 (11QPsA), a psalm that was interpreted in a manner so as to deal specifically with demonology. His name is also associated with demons in three Nag Hammadi texts. In any event, it should be noted

In another narrative, this time from the First Century C.E., we find Josephus' narration about the contemporary exorcist Eleazar, to whom he was an eyewitness. Josephus states that Eleazar relied not only upon magical roots but also called upon Solomon's name to effect exorcisms.⁴¹⁴ These narratives, along with Jesus' comments that the Sons of the Pharisees cast out demons (Mt. 12:27; Lk. 11:19 par.),⁴¹⁵ and the well-known passage from Acts 19, which tells of the itinerant Jewish exorcists who attempted to use the name of Jesus in exorcisms, establishes that first century Jews practiced exorcism and that many believed that numinous names, even apart from God's own, could be used as an apotropaic shield. One last point remains. Insofar as God's name could drive out demons, it could also heal illness, as we have seen in the Greco-Roman magic section, for there existed a widely spread belief that demons caused disease.⁴¹⁶ Thus, the Name could by virtue of the one act perform the other.

At this point some provisional comments and observations are in order. First, Greco-Roman magical praxis demonstrates that an adjuring (ὄρκισμα) of the demon or illness was often times effected by calling upon the name of the demon or god. We see that here also. Second, the instrumental use of the preposition ἐν, with τῷ ὀνόματι and the genitive of a person, is quite rare in Greek.⁴¹⁷ Thus, the use of ἐν in these texts indicates that we are witnessing the employment of a Semitic idiom. As our Aramaic examples attest, invocations

that the use of Solomon's name is most likely not because his name was thought to be numinous, but rather because Solomon knew the techniques for warding off demons. See, *On the Origin of the World*; II,5:107; *Apocalypse of Adam* V,5:78-79; *Testimony of Truth* IX, 3:70. For further reading see Dennis C. Duling, "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David," *Harvard Theological Review* 68 (1975): 235-252, and, "The Eleazar Miracle and Solomon's Magical Wisdom in Flavius Josephus' *Antiquitates Judaicae* 8.42-49," *HTR* 78 No.1 (1985): 16.

⁴¹²One must assume in this particular case that the presumed efficacy of the Seal was due primarily to the divine name rather than to the legend of Solomon, as can be shown by examining comparative material. For further details of the *lamella* itself see Kotansky, "Greek Exorcistic Amulets," 267-8.

⁴¹³As quoted in Kotansky, "Greek Exorcistic Amulets," 273.

⁴¹⁴*A.J.* 8.2.5 (44-49).

⁴¹⁵Eitrem conjectures that these exorcists probably used Jewish formulas that are familiar to us from this era. He mentions specifically, "in the name of Abraham, Issac and Jacob." See Samuel Eitrem, *Some notes on the Demonology in the New Testament. Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. Supplet. XII*, (Oslo: A.W. Brøgger, 1950), 7.

⁴¹⁶Heitmüller, *INJ*, 140.

⁴¹⁷Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 244.

were done ‘into the name’ and employed the preposition *bet* (בשם). It is also worthy of note that we nowhere observe the use of the preposition *lamed* “to” or “for” (i.e. לשם) with the use of the name of someone. This observation will be useful for my review of the phrase that will be undertaken later on. Third, in exorcisms the Name seems to have been construed as the agent or medium through which the divine being was anticipated to join the supernatural battle. Fourth, there appears to be a clear emphasis on apotropaic magic. This emphasis is seen in the incantational bowls, Josephus, and the DSS texts, not to mention the New Testament.

Corroboration from literary sources that such exorcistic practices continued into the Christian era are numerous.⁴¹⁸ Putting aside for the moment the *PGM* we have such practices attested to in variegated sources. In Justin's *Dialogue* (85.3), Justin deals with a Jewish magician where he expresses the sentiment that Jewish exorcist employ the Name as their apotropaic medium:

If you exorcise a demon in the name of any of those who once lived among you-kings, righteous men, prophets, patriarchs-it will not obey you. But if you exercise the demon in [the Name]... of the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, it may obey you. No doubt your exorcists apply these techniques when they exorcise, just like the Gentiles, and they use fumigations and incantations.

And just decades later Irenaeus ventures a similar opinion:

And...all things have been placed under the sway of Him who is styled the Most High, and the Almighty. By calling upon Him, even before the coming of our Lord, men were saved both from most wicked spirits, and from all kinds of demons, and from every sort of apostate power....This was the case...because they [demons] knew of the existence of Him who is God over all, at whose invocation they trembled, as there does tremble every creature, and principality, and power...⁴¹⁹

These texts fit perfectly with the portrait of Jewish magical practice painted by the amulets, incantation bowls, non-literary texts, and as I mentioned earlier, Josephus and the Qumran community. Moreover, these texts date to the Second Century C.E. and confirm that the Name was used for exorcisms (and certainly magic) in this early period.

All of these materials support the contention of Heitmüller who correctly noted that “Es ist eine völlig unberechtigte Spiritualisierung, wenn man behauptet, der ‚Name‘ Gottes sei nur als

⁴¹⁸While direct evidence from the first century is fragmentary the Jewish (?) *defixio* from Megara is dated to the first or early second century C.E. and invokes sacred Jewish names. See Kotansky, “Greek Exorcistic Texts,” 275.

⁴¹⁹*Ad Haer.* II. 6.2.

der Ausdruck für Gottes Wesen, seine Attributen...[for] Die übernatürlichen Kräfte stehen nun auch dem Menschen...⁴²⁰ Clearly, the Name was viewed as having numinous and apotropaic qualities. With this review in hand I will now turn my attention to systematizing the various phenomenological uses of the divine name.

⁴²⁰Heitmüller, *INJ*, 134-135.

PHENOMENOLOGICAL USES OF THE NAME OF GOD

Nicht der Inhalt, geschweige denn die Etymologie seines Inhalts sondern der Gebrauch und die Wichtigkeit des so oder anders lautenden Gottesnamens und die mit ihm verknüpften Vorstellungen verliehen auch dem schem-Begriff seine Wertschätzung.⁴²¹

CONFESSING THE NAME

The biblical Homologia has its roots in Jewish cultus and liturgy.⁴²² The literal meaning of $\Pi\tau\iota\eta$ (LXX, $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$) is to agree upon the same thing.⁴²³ In the Greek papyri the word $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ takes on the sense of a compact or agreement reflecting a legal character. In religion we find a more varied use, e.g., for commitment to vows, as well as for the confessing of sins, to name but a few uses. It can also take on the meaning of an outward expression of one's faith. As such the word can take on the meaning both of acknowledgement,⁴²⁴ as well as praise.⁴²⁵ Given this it is not surprising that the Homologia is almost always directed toward God.⁴²⁶ In this context of course, public confession is often presupposed. It carries the thought of magnifying God by confessing or rehearsing his mighty acts.

Given the fundamental meaning of praise or confession toward God the original *Sitz-im-Leben* of this use of word has been surmised to reside in various cultic settings.⁴²⁷ Such praise has the objective of acknowledging the power and salvation of God and broadcasting the same to others.

Insofar as confession encompasses a person's religious belief it can therefore be used to represent a person's religious affiliation. In this category of usage we find numerous examples.

⁴²¹ Grether, *NWGAT*, 17.

⁴²² Otto Michel, " $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$," *THWNT* V. 5, 202.

⁴²³ The LXX prefers the compounds of $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$, such as *exomologesthai* and *exomologesis*, which in secular Greek denote public admission or acknowledgment. On the basis of Heb. *yada*, however, the idea of praising God is added to that of acknowledgment (cf. 1 Kgs. 8:33, 35 and Neh. 9:3 for the linking of the two).

⁴²⁴ E.g., *Ladder of Jacob* 7:35. It should be noted that כִּנָּה could also be translated by 'confess.'

⁴²⁵ Günther Bornkamm, "Lobpreis, Bekenntnis und Opfer: Eine alttestamentliche Studie," in *Geschichte und Glaube, Ester Teil. Gesammelte Aufsätze Band III* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968), 122.

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*, 122-123.

⁴²⁷ *Ibid.*

For example, confession could be directed toward affirming that the God of Israel was to be acknowledged as the one true Lord. To cite but one relevant text, Josephus (*BJ* 7.417-418), in a polemically tainted passage, refers to the Jewish refusal to acknowledge Caesar as Lord (cf. 2 Macc. 7:37). He describes them as those:

Whose courage, or whether we ought to call it madness, or hardiness in their opinions, everybody was amazed at; (418) for when all sorts of torments and vexations of their bodies that could be devised were made use of them, they could not get anyone of them to comply so far as to confess or seem to confess (ὁμολογήσωσιν), that Caesar was their lord; but they preserved their own opinion, in spite of all the distress they were brought to, as if they received these torments and the fire itself with bodies insensible of pain, and with a soul that in a manner rejoiced under them.

Further uses of the term are seen in cases where one confesses-sometimes in the name of another-that they had transgressed in some manner and now seek repentance and reconciliation. This usage could be framed in such a fashion so as to emphasize the role which the divine name played in such confessions. For example, in I Kings 8:35 we read of Solomon interceding for the people of Israel and he asks God to hear His people when they pray toward the Temple because it is the place “which you said, My Name shall be there.” Solomon then goes on to importune God to forgive Israel when they repent and confess His name:

When the heavens are shut up and there is no rain, because they have sinned against Thee, and they pray toward this place and *confess Thy Name* (ἐξομολογήσονται τῷ ὀνόματί σου) [emphasis mine] and turn from their sin.

Similar examples of this phenomenon are found in II Chron. 6:24, where we read, “When your people Israel, having sinned against you...turn again to you, confess your Name, pray and plead with you in this house, then hear in heaven, forgive the sin of your people...When... they have sinned against you, and then they pray toward this place, confess your Name, and turn from their sin... then hear in heaven, and forgive the sin of your servants...” (cf. I Ki 8:33, “When Thy people Israel...have sinned against Thee, if they turn to Thee again and confess Thy Name and pray and make supplication to Thee in this house...”).⁴²⁸

In later Judaism this usage carried the thought of a confession of sin mated with penitential prayer. For example, it is said that the great men of the past publicly confess their guilt (Dan. 9:1ff.; Jdt. 9:1ff., etc.). Prominent in this type of confession is the concept of divine judgment, which inspired the need for confession, but which also averted it.

⁴²⁸ Other passages which reflect this motif are found in PsSol 6:1; 9:6.

We have just seen how the name of God and confession of sins found expression in the Old Testament, but one of the most intriguing examples are found in the Pseudepigrapha. I refer here to the act of confessing the Name (=repenting in the Name) for expiation of sin in *Joseph and Aseneth* 15:7, where Repentance is depicted as a particularizing manifestation of God who entreats God on behalf of those “who repent in the name of the Most High.”

Another place where the Name and confession plays an important role within a religious context is found in the *Psalms of Solomon* (15.2), where the Psalmist states that only the person who confesses the Name will be enfranchised to receive power. Here we see a distinct connection drawn between the Name and the dispensation of divine power.

All of the foregoing attests that for the Torah-faithful the Name was the preeminent source of authority, forgiveness and access to God. Indeed, it was a symbol for God Himself. It was in His name alone that sins were to be forgiven. In fact, since confessing the Name resulted in the remission of sin, this function placed the Name at the very heart of the relationship between God and man. By confessing the Name man and God were reconciled. Not surprisingly, therefore, this function also placed the Name at the very focal point of the cultus, for as we observed in the introductory chapter, the very essence of the cultus is a setting and specific actions whereby God and man are brought together.

INVOKING THE NAME

Of all of the various practices in which the Name was central, none was more important than the use of the Name in invocation. The formulaic יהוה שם רב occurs approximately 26 times in the Old Testament,⁴²⁹ and its Septuagintal equivalents (e.g., ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, ἐπικληθῆναι, ἐπονομάζειν, καλεῖν, and ὀνομάζειν)⁴³⁰ display several remarkable traits which deserve notice.

⁴²⁹ According to Jacob's count this usage occurs 17 times (*ING*, 25), while Boehmer counts 21 occurrences (*BIN*, 5) for the name of God and 8 times in connection with the name of a person or thing. Davies, in his *Name and Way of the Lord* (pg. 103), counts 25 occurrences in the MT. Examples include Ex. 31:2; 35:20; Num. 32:38, 42; Jos. 21: 9; I Chron. 6:50; Jud. 18:29; Isa. 40:26; 43:1; 44:5; 45:3-4; 48:1; Ps. 49:12; Est. 2:14; and 36:17a. This phrase when combined with the Name of God occurs in Gen. 4:26; 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25; Ex. 33:19; 34:5; I Ki. 18:24; II Ki. 5:11; Isa. 12:4; 41:25; 43:7; 64:6; 65:1; Jer. 10:25; Joel 3:5; Zeph. 3:9; Zech. 13:9; Ps. 79:6; 80:19; 105:1; 116:4,13,17; Sir. 47:18b. The expression could also be applied with respect to profane names although the semantic meaning is changed accordingly.

⁴³⁰ The vast majority of cases employ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι or one of its middle voice variants (counting not only this verb stem with the Name, but also with God and Lord, etc.). By Davies' count, in the LXX there are 114 occurrences with the middle voice; of these all but 11 refer to an invocation of God. Davies furthermore points out

Before I delve into these traits I need to point out that the meaning of the idiom, **יהוה קרא בשם**, has engendered some controversy. The trouble seems to be whether the idiom means calling upon the name of God, or in contrast, proclaiming His name.⁴³¹ Niles has persuasively argued that both interpretations are correct. Proclaiming the Name, Niles shows, occurs in the context of thanksgiving, while the invocational nuance occurs during petitions.⁴³²

Turning now to the aforementioned traits for **ἐπικαλεῖσθαι**, the first is that in the vast preponderance of places in the LXX where God is invoked (inclusive of all verbs; **ἐπικαλεῖν**, and **ἐπικληθῆναι**, **ἐπονομάζειν**, **καλεῖν**, and **ὀνομάζειν**; some 176 times in all)⁴³³ the name given is simply *kyrios*, or the compound *kyrios-theos*.⁴³⁴ Additionally, it is fair to say that this expression is reflective of a technical term.⁴³⁵ Further, this rendering of the Tetragrammaton by the term *kyrios* signifies how Jews of that era viewed God-He was the Lord and sovereign over all things.⁴³⁶

The second trait worthy of note is that the majority of those places that speak of invoking the name of God do so within the context of ritual activities.⁴³⁷ In fact, the phrase is almost

that this phrase, in relation to calling upon the gods, goes as far back, in Greece at least, as the fifth century B.C.E. (Herodotus, *Histories* 1.99; 2.39; 3.8, 65; Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 1280). As for the antiquity of using the middle voice see Xenophon's *Hellenica* 2.3.55. For further reading on the use of the middle voice in *evocatio* consult Davies, *Name and Way of the Lord*, 107 fn. 17 and Jacobs, *ING*, 141.

⁴³¹ According to Niles, the action of 'proclaiming the name' occurs only with respect to God. Evidently, there are no examples that apply this action to humans. See, *TNGIW*, 75.

⁴³² I direct the reader to Niles' discussion on this topic. See, *Ibid.*, 75-93.

⁴³³ So Friedrich Nötscher, "Epiklese in biblischer Beleuchtung," in *Vom Alten zum Neuen Testament Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1962), 221.

⁴³⁴ Gen. 4: 26; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25; 48: 16; Nu. 21:3; Dt. 12:11, 26; 14:23; 16:2, 15; 28:10; II Ch. 6:20; Is. 64:6; Jer. 10:25. Nägelsbach takes this pattern to mean (in prayers at least) that the name YHWH was not a name of power for only by invoking the proper authentic name could God be moved. Part of his arguments rests on the dubious assumption that many prayers are *ipsissima verba* records. In any event, Jews understood that Kyrios was a reverential substitute for YHWH and it stands to reason that those who did not know how to pronounce the Tetragrammaton used it in invocations, especially in apotropaic contexts. See Nägelsbach, *DNGJHS*, 27-29.

⁴³⁵ So K.L. Schmidt, "ἐπικαλέω," in *THWNT Vol. 3*, 499.

⁴³⁶ Grether, *NWGAT*, 17.

⁴³⁷ *Ibid.*, 19. Of course the root of this usage stems from the Hebrew where the phrase **יהוה קרא בשם** is itself formulaic and generally restricted to calling the name of YHWH in cultic activities. See Niles, *TNGIW*, 88.

solely restricted to this usage and is almost always found exclusively tied to the name 'YHWH' in cultic usage, rarely with Elohim or other names.⁴³⁸

The third trait worth considering is that the invocation of the Name is intimately bound to petitionary use in times of duress. It is, for example, remarkable that in all of the Laments found within the Psalms there is only one reference to calling upon the name Elohim rather than YHWH (Ps.57:3).⁴³⁹

Indeed, as Deut. 4:7 demonstrates, for this reason the association of the presence of God and invocation was remarkable in Israel and the passage itself deserves full citation, "For what great nation is there that has a god so near to it as is the Lord our God whenever we call on Him?" The author of Exodus draws the cord of this connection even more tightly when he claims that God proclaims that "You shall make an altar of earth for Me, and you shall sacrifice on it... [and] in every place where I cause My name to be remembered [i.e., to be invoked and proclaimed], I will come to you and bless you (Ex. 20:24)." As these passages attest, invoking the name of the God was something which characterized cultic activities.

Now, interestingly, the practice itself is claimed to go back to the time of Adam where, according to Gen. 4:25-26 we read:

And Adam had relations with his wife again; and she gave birth to a son, and named him Seth, for, she said, 'God has appointed me another offspring in place of Abel; for Cain killed him.' And to Seth, to him also a son was born; and he called his name Enosh. Then men began to call upon the name of the Lord.

Of some interest here is that Brongers has rightly stressed that the last line of this passage can be translated as, "Men began to worship YHWH."⁴⁴⁰ Thus, we can create the equation: invocation=worship.

Of further interest is Philo's take on this passage. Philo writes on this passage that "Enosh, being interpreted, means hope. 'He hoped first,' says Moses, 'to call upon the name of the Lord his God.'"⁴⁴¹

⁴³⁸ Ibid., 12. Von Rad emphasizes the importance of the name of God when he says that it is "das Herz des altisraelitischen Kultus." See Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band I*, 196.

⁴³⁹ This stands in contrast to hymnic praise where various surrogates for the Tetragrammaton are found relatively often.

⁴⁴⁰ Brongers comments, "Die beste Übersetzung der Stelle wäre demnach: damals fing man an Jhwh zu verehren." This passage establishes a solid connection between invocation and worship. See Brongers, "Die Wendung *b'šēm jhwh* im Alten Testament," 12.

This cultic use of the name of God is also claimed for the patriarch Abraham, at least according to Genesis (12:8; 13:4; 21:33).⁴⁴² Perhaps it is this claimed antiquity for the practice that leads most investigators to suspect that the formula **קרא בשם** is the basis of both all later Jewish prayer and cultic devotion, not to mention Jewish magic.⁴⁴³

This liturgical usage is also attested to early in other passages too, for example in Deut. 32:3, where Moses invoked the Name, “I invoke the Name of YHWH, ascribe give greatness to our God.” This sort of act is more than an *invocare*, it is also a calling out of the Name as a type of doxology.⁴⁴⁴

Further use in this direction can be found in the repeated calling upon the Name when a cultic object, such as when an altar was constructed, or an offering dedicated, (e.g., Gen. 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25).

Given this claimed antiquity for invoking the Name in Jewish cultus it is not surprising that the true Jew was to call upon God⁴⁴⁵ by His “inextinguishable name.”⁴⁴⁶ Indeed, for the Israelite it could be said that “Happy is the man whose heart is ready to call on the name of the Lord.”⁴⁴⁷ In point of fact, even people such as Moses, Aaron and Samuel are described as, “...among those who called on His name.”⁴⁴⁸ In a reciprocal fashion God states that He will answer those who invoke His name (Zeph. 3:9); a promise that establishes the fact that it is

⁴⁴¹ *Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari solet* 138.

⁴⁴² Here, however, presumably Abraham simply invoked God through some other name than YHWH. Isaac also is said to invoke the name of God during cultic acts at 24:23.

⁴⁴³ Heitmüller, *INJ*, 169. Bietenhard believes however, as do I, that the invocation of the Name was probably originally based on magical conceptions (see, “*ῥῶμα*,” 254). In any event, it is worth pointing out that the sole unambiguous *cultic* use of the name of YHWH in the Old Testament with respect to *prayer* is found at Ps. 63:4. Here in a Psalm of praise, the Psalmist says, “So I will bless Thee as long as I live; I will lift up my hands in Thy name (*BHS* 63:5; **בשמיך**). Niles, along similar lines, notes that the idiom, **קרא בשם יהוה**, was used in petitions that were delivered in an act which included the *invocation* of the name of God. See, Untergaßmair, *INJJE*, 237 fn. 156 and Niles, *TNGIW*, 176.

⁴⁴⁴ Brongers, “Die Wendung *bʿšēm jhwh* im Alten Testament,” 12.

⁴⁴⁵ E.g. Jer. 10:25; Ps. 79: 6; Isa. 26:13; 41:25; Ps. Sol. 16:1. In slightly different contexts see *inter alia*, I Kings 8:43; Bar. 3:7.

⁴⁴⁶ Prayer of Joseph 9.

⁴⁴⁷ Ps. Sol. 6:1.

invocation which initiates relationship with God.⁴⁴⁹ In addition, the most significant of ritual acts, sacrifice and worship, are bound to the Name in Old Testament piety.⁴⁵⁰ In fact, the Name even became an object of love.⁴⁵¹

Of further importance are those passages, such as Zech. 13:9 and Joel 3:5 (LXX), which state that in the Day of the Lord's visitation those who call upon His Name will be saved.⁴⁵² In light of these passages we find that the most common situation for the act of invoking the name of YHWH is either for help in distress or for salvation.⁴⁵³ Indeed, this latter connection is amply demonstrated in Ps. 116:13, where the author states that he will:

Lift up the cup of salvation,
And call upon the name of the LORD.

The belief that God would come and save those who call upon His Name is strongly emphasized in passages such as Psalm 20: 1, 8, which states, "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will make mention of the name of the Lord our God". This belief is also attested in the Pseudepigraphical literature, for example in *Joseph and Aseneth*, where Aseneth in great fear at the impending approach of Pharaoh and his men "called upon the Name of the Lord her God" for protection (26:7).⁴⁵⁴ Aseneth is described as someone who takes, "refuge in the Name of the Lord God (16:16)."⁴⁵⁵ Indeed, she even feels led to speak out a soliloquy on how she was able to sum up the courage to invoke the "terrible holy Name" (11:15-18). In this fearful refrain Aseneth is said to be afraid to "open her mouth and to name the name of God" (v.15; cf. 11:18; 26:8).

⁴⁴⁸ Ps. 99:6.

⁴⁴⁹ So too Lois Ann Perlewitz, *A Christology of the Book of Acts: Modes of Presence*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Saint Louis University, (Ann Arbor: U.M.I., 1977), 162.

⁴⁵⁰ E.g., Ps. 54:6; 63: 4-5; 105: 1-3 (cf. 1 Chron. 16: 10); 116:17.

⁴⁵¹ E.g., Ps. 5:11; 69: 36; 119: 132 and Isa. 56: 6.

⁴⁵² Zechariah reads, "And I will bring the third part through the fire, Refine them as silver is refined, And test them as gold is tested. They will call on My name, And I will answer them; I will say, 'They are My people,' And they will say, 'The LORD is my God'." (cf. Ps. 9:10; 91:14-15).

⁴⁵³ Niles, *TNGIW*, 83.

⁴⁵⁴ See also Ps. Sol. 15:2 where the author states that during persecution he "called on the Lord's name."

⁴⁵⁵ *Joseph and Aseneth* 16.16.

A similar view stands behind Ps. Sol. 7.6, where the author confidently boasts that “While your Name lives among us, we shall receive mercy, and the Gentile will not overcome us.”⁴⁵⁶ Here it can be seen that the passage reflects the belief that as long as the name of YHWH is named the people of God will be saved from their enemies.⁴⁵⁷ In a similar vein, Josephus (*BJ* 5.438) states that during times of duress, one was to call upon the “dreadful” name of God.

Now invocation could also be used to erect community boundary markers. For example, in Ex. 23:13 Moses states, “...be on your guard; and do not mention the name of other gods, nor let them be heard from your mouth.”⁴⁵⁸ Similarly, Joshua 23:7 reads, “Do not associate with these nations that remain among you; do not invoke the names of their gods or swear by them.”⁴⁵⁹ In this context it is of some interest to consider that it is claimed that God Himself will strip the people of the names of the Baals and reveal to them how he is to be invoked.⁴⁶⁰

In fact, the very act of invoking the name of YHWH could also serve as the litmus test for delineating those nations who do not follow YHWH, and correspondingly, those who are to be destroyed.⁴⁶¹ Conversely, when the people of Israel have strayed from following YHWH they are described as those who have become “like one who is unclean...and all our righteous acts are like filthy rags... No one calls on your name, or strives to lay hold of you.”⁴⁶² These references demonstrate that a religious conventicle could be defined by their ritual practices, in this case invocation.

There is yet another powerful connection between invocation of the Name and God’s Name; that is, invocation insures God’s presence. We find the foundation for this belief being laid in earlier texts. For example, in Ex. 20:24, YHWH promises to come whenever His Name is

⁴⁵⁶ The phrase, “While your Name lives among us” can be loosely rendered as “While your Name is in currency among us...”

⁴⁵⁷ Cf. Psalm 44:5; Jeremiah 10:6; Proverbs 18:10; Psalm 20:1 and ; Sir 51:3.

⁴⁵⁸ Although here the verb employed is *הזכר*.

⁴⁵⁹ cf. Mi. 4:5.

⁴⁶⁰ Hos. 2: 16-17.

⁴⁶¹ Ps. 79:6; Jer 10:25.

⁴⁶² Isa. 64:6-7.

invoked. Here invocation and God's presence are ineluctably intertwined.⁴⁶³ Another example of this phenomenon appears to be the theophany described in Ex. 33:17-19 and 34:5-6. In this narrative God reveals Himself to Moses, but will not allow Moses to see His face; instead He offers to call out His own Name.⁴⁶⁴ Notwithstanding the problems involving both source and redaction, which both of these two passages bear, they imply that the calling out of the Name is surely a *symbolon* of YHWH's presence,⁴⁶⁵ and through this presence the promises and covenant of YHWH are vouchsafed.

Now as I mentioned earlier the invoking of the Name is tied directly to cultic activities in sacred rites.⁴⁶⁶ Here the invoking the name of God is a *terminus technicus* that legitimates the cultic site and its activities.⁴⁶⁷ As Grether has pointed out the invocation of the name of the divinity was an integral component of ritual offerings.⁴⁶⁸ In effect, the invocation of the deity insured his presence in the rituals-they were an indispensable element for their success.⁴⁶⁹ Indeed, it can be said that in cultus the name of the God was in many respects the centerpiece of

⁴⁶³See Jacob, *ING*, 42 and Heinz-Josef Fabry, "יְהוָה," in *ThWAT Band. VIII*, eds. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Helmer Ringgren, (Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln: Kohlhammer, 1973-1977), 135.

⁴⁶⁴It should be noted that various scholars, noting the strange nature of this claim, have preferred to see Moses as the subject of the verb; that is, Moses calls out the name of God. For a discussion of the problems encountered with this passage see Niles, *TNGIW*, 125-128, who has marshaled several weighty objections to this reading of the text. Davies, for his part, has also noted the difficulty in envisioning God invoking His own name. He quotes Mobley favorably to the effect that God is simply offering a demonstration for Moses. Thus, God's action is designed to teach Moses how to call upon Him and insure His presence. For more see Davies, *Name and Way of the Lord*, 105.

⁴⁶⁵Grether, *NWGAT*, 20 and Niles, *TNGIW*, 158.

⁴⁶⁶As Josephus mentions, Moses invoked the Name of God during animal sacrifices, *AJ* 2.12.4 (275).

⁴⁶⁷Brongers, "Die Wendung *b'sēm jhwh*," 12; Mehlmann, *Der "Name" Gottes*, 70; and K. Baltzer, "Namenglaube," 1303.

⁴⁶⁸Grether, *NWGAT*, 19.

⁴⁶⁹*Ibid.*

cultic ritual.⁴⁷⁰ Simply put, the invocation of the name of God was the most elementary, and most important component, of ritual action.⁴⁷¹ Commenting on this Besnard has stated that:

L'invocation de dieu par son nom propre, à haute voix, était peut-être l'acte le plus solennel et le plus grave de toutes les religions archaïques.⁴⁷²

Likewise Schmidt was led to comment that "Die Gemeinde, die dieses Wort [i.e., the name of the divinity] zu Anfang ihres Gottesdienstes ausspricht, stellt sich damit in den Bereich der Wirkung dieses Namens."⁴⁷³

This theologoumenon of the interconnectedness of ritual acts and the divine name is highlighted in Malachi, where in perhaps the most interesting cultic setting in all the Old Testament (in terms of God's Name), the Name is figuratively viewed as the object of smoke offerings (Mal. 1:11). As Grether notes, the immediately preceding verses provide the thematic relationship between the name of God and its symbolic place in praise directed toward God. Thus, here we find the intertwining between the Name itself and praise directed toward God.

Yet other passages associate some cultic activity, usually worship, with the act of proclaiming the Name. Isa. 12:4-6, for example, states, "Give thanks to the LORD, call on His name," in connection with "Praise the LORD in song" and "Make them remember that His name is exalted." The same association is seen in Ps. 105:1, "O give thanks to the LORD, call upon His name; Make known His deeds among the peoples."

Other passages hint at a cultic background in the context of purification. One text of note is Zeph. 3:8, where in the End Times God declares that:

For the day when I rise up to the prey,
Indeed, My decision is to gather nations, To assemble kingdoms,
To pour out on them My indignation, All My burning anger;
For all the earth will be devoured By the fire of My zeal.
For then I will give to the peoples purified lips,
That all of them may call on the name of the LORD,
To serve Him shoulder to shoulder.

⁴⁷⁰ Grether, *NWGAT*, 19, 39, 43. Heitmüller states, correctly in my judgment, that the Name served a sacramental function in Judaism. See *INJ*, 155.

⁴⁷¹ Heitmüller, *INJ*, 168.

⁴⁷² Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 25.

⁴⁷³ Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 38.

Zechariah too (13:9) speaks of God purifying His people so that they may call upon His name. The text reads:

This third I will bring into the fire; I will refine them like silver
and test them like gold. They will call on my name
and I will answer them; I will say, 'They are my people,'
and they will say, 'The LORD is our God.'" (NIV translation)

These passages make a good case for seeing a tight association between cultic activity (in this case purification) and invoking the name of God.

Other areas where the invocation of the Name could be applied were in polemical confrontations where the greater power of YHWH would be set against other gods. In I Kings 18:25-36 Elijah challenges the priests of Baal to a contest of power. Elijah, for his part, was to "call on the name of the Lord," while the priests of Baal were to "call on the name of their god" (BHS אֱלֹהֵיכֶם בָּשָׁם אֶקְרָא; LXX καὶ βοᾶτε [call out loud, i.e. together] ἐν ὀνόματι θεῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπικαλέσομαι ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ μου).⁴⁷⁴ Upon calling on YHWH, fire came from the heavens and consumed the "the burnt offering and the wood and the stones and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench (I Kings 18: 38)." Needless to say, YHWH comes out the victor.

Another passage of interest is Amos 6:10. This passage relates the story of the promised destruction of Jerusalem by non-Jews. The narrative claims that a surviving relative, or a undertaker, will enter the house of those who are slain and ask if anyone is still left in the building. It is then claimed that any survivor will say, "Keep quiet. For the name of the LORD is not to be mentioned." Here we find a possible allusion to the belief that speaking out the Name would cause God to come on the scene and continue the destruction.⁴⁷⁵

Along more apotropaic lines the *Test. of Sol.* 4.12, 5.9 states that in order to subdue the various demons Solomon invoked the name of God. Indeed, it is even claimed that the Name

⁴⁷⁴Curiously, Niles states that the phrase, "call in the name of G," where G represents the name of the god, is not found in non-biblical examples. While it is indeed curious that so little evidence of the exact phrase exists, one can not help but wonder why this expression is put in the mouth of the prophets of Baal if the phrase was not widely recognized as a common cultic expression. Niles states, "As far as is presently ascertainable, the idiom *qārâ' b'šm G* is not attested among Israel's neighbors." See Niles, *TNGIW*, 65.

⁴⁷⁵Nägelsbach adopts a more cautious view and notes that this passage only illustrates what the relative, or perhaps a non-Jew, might think, not necessarily what a Jew would think. Giesebrecht however takes a different tack and I think his view that the Name carries the power to insure God's presence is correct. Thus, naming the Name was thought to bring God on the scene. See *DATSGN*, 128 and *DNGJHS*, 24.

could even bring dread upon the non-Jew; intimating a numinous conception of the Name.⁴⁷⁶ And in an eschatological context, when the evil end-time days arrive, the author of Jubilees 23:21 claims those who do not follow the path of righteousness will “pronounce the great Name, but not in truth or righteousness.”

In summary, as numerous texts show, invoking the name of God could insure many salutary effects, viz. God’s presence and power. The invocation of God’s name could bring about effects as divergent as successful exorcisms, to successful demonstrations of God’s power in the face of pagan challenges. Also, invocation of the name of the ‘true’ God could be used to delineate those who really worship Him from those who are outside the covenant with the one God.

MAKING AN OATH IN THE NAME

The expression **נשבע בשם** (or **זכר** as the case may be⁴⁷⁷) occurs only a few times in the O.T., and in every case it has either God as the referent (e.g., *ba YHWH* Judg. 21:7 II Sam. 19:8 and I Kings 2:8), or His name (Lev. 19:12; Deut. 6:13; 10:20; I Sam. 20:42; Jer. 12:16; Zech. 5:4).⁴⁷⁸ Accordingly, the structure of the vow, at least as it is found in biblical usage, normally contains at some point an appeal or address to God.⁴⁷⁹

As for the background of this practice, an oath given in the name of God can be traced from antecedent pagan practices.⁴⁸⁰ Perhaps the most striking aspect that this background material highlights is that vows were made almost always directed to God, at least as evidenced in biblical usage.⁴⁸¹

⁴⁷⁶E.g., Deut. 28:10; Ps. 102: 15; Isa. 59: 19. To this the circumlocution in Ps Sol 7:6 might be added. Here the claim is made that as long as the Name is resident in Israel the nation is guaranteed victory.

⁴⁷⁷E.g., Jos. 23:7 and Is. 48:1.

⁴⁷⁸See Tony W. Cartledge, *Vows in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Sheffield: J.S.O.T. Press, 1992), 140. An essential component in oaths is the use of the divine name. On this matter see Friedrich Horst, “Der Eid im Alten Testament,” in *Gottes Recht: Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im Alten Testament*, ed. Hans Walter Wolff, (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961), 297. It should be observed that other expressions also occur using various circumlocutions such as giving an oath by ‘the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.’

⁴⁷⁹Following Cartledge, *ibid.*, 145.

⁴⁸⁰So Jacob, *ING*, 28 and Cartledge, *Vows*, 134.

⁴⁸¹So Cartledge, *Vows*, 134 and Brongers, “Die Wendung *b’sēm jhwh*,” 10.

Essentially, within Judaism the oath was activated, so to speak, by the speaking out of the Name. Philo proposes this very thing in his *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* 93:

And it happens, indeed, that our opinions are confirmed by an oath; but that an oath itself is confirmed by the addition of the name of God. God, therefore, does not become credible because of an oath, but even an oath is confirmed by God.

In similar fashion, Josephus claims that that the name of God is expressly added to oaths to make them valid.⁴⁸²

Some scholars have concluded that this binding of God's name in oaths explains Ex. 20:7, which states that the speaking out of God's name in an untrue oath violates the command to not use the Name in vain. In other words, it is believed that this violation drew God into the false oath in order to punish the violator.⁴⁸³ This thought probably lies behind the wrath of God witnessed to in Zech. 5:1-4 concerning false oaths undertaken in God's name. In the narrative, Zechariah has a vision in which he sees a flying scroll. The scroll symbolizes God's wrath. What is of interest here is what God's wrath is directed at; theft and falsely swearing in His name. The text reads:

Then I lifted up my eyes again and looked, and behold, *there was* a flying scroll. 2 And he said to me, 'What do you see?' And I answered, 'I see a flying scroll; its length is twenty cubits and its width ten cubits.' 3 Then he said to me, 'This is the curse that is going forth over the face of the whole land; surely everyone who steals will be purged away according to the writing on one side, and everyone who swears will be purged away according to the writing on the other side.' 4 'I will make it go forth,' declares the LORD of hosts, 'and it will enter the house of the thief and the house of the one who swears falsely by My name; and it will spend the night within that house and consume it with its timber and stones.'

Along these same lines Philo mentions in his *De Specialibus Legibus II* (the *Tenth Festival* 254) that the most egregious violations of piety include "to show a contempt for the sacred name of God by means of perjury." Again, in *De Specialibus Legibus IV* (40), he states concerning the nature of false swearing:

Every false accuser is at once a perjured man, thinking but little of piety, since he has not just proofs; on which account he has recourse to what is called the inartificial mode of proof, that by oaths, thinking that by the invocation of God he shall produce belief among those who

⁴⁸² *AJ* 27.93.

⁴⁸³ As Brongers notes, the Name must be viewed cautiously for any misuse would invite God's wrath. See, Brongers, "Die Wendung *b'šēm jhwh*," 11.

hear him. But let such a one know that he is ungodly and impious, inasmuch as he is defiling that which by nature is undefiled, the good and holy name of God.⁴⁸⁴

Moving beyond Philo, we see that in a positive sense the Name insured God's presence and that the Name also functioned as a source of the power of God, or His authority as God, in order to vouchsafe the oath.⁴⁸⁵ In fact even God swears by His own name, for there is no greater name by which He can swear.⁴⁸⁶

Normally, at the fulfillment of these vows the person thanked God by making public payment to God for helping the person fulfill the vow. To cite but one example, public sacrifices were used to express thankfulness at the fulfillment of the vow.⁴⁸⁷

Furthermore, vows were derived from the personal piety of the person—indeed their creation do not reflect the concerns of organized religion.⁴⁸⁸ This characteristic of personal piety is clearly on display in Ps. 50:14-15 where the Psalmist proclaims:

Offer to God a sacrifice of thanksgiving,
And pay your vows to the Most High;
And call upon Me in the day of trouble;
I shall rescue you, and you will honor Me.

It should also be borne in mind that because vows were made to God they were considered sacred, and thus the payment of the vow was also sacred.⁴⁸⁹ An excellent example of

⁴⁸⁴ Clement, in his *Stromata* (VII.VIII) says, "The man of proved character in such piety is far from being apt to lie and to swear. For an oath is a decisive affirmation, with the taking of the divine name." And Tertullian provides us with an insight into just how sanctified divine names could be in the context of oaths. Tertullian, in his *Apologia* (28), castigates the impiety of some when they swear false oaths in the names of lesser deities. However, when they swear in the name of Caesar they then tell the truth. Tertullian remarks, "This brings us, then, to the second ground of accusation, that we are guilty of treason against a majesty more august; for you do homage with a greater dread and an intense reverence to Caesar, than Olympian Jove himself.... But this is not done by you on any other ground than regard to a power whose presence you vividly realize; so that also in this you are convicted of impiety to your gods, inasmuch as you show a greater reverence to a human sovereignty than you do to them. Then, too, among you, people far more readily swear a false oath in the name of all the gods, than in the name of the single genius of Caesar." Furthermore, in his *de Idol* XX, he states concerning oaths in the names of false gods, "Further, what will an oath be, in the name of gods whom you have forsworn, but a collusion of faith with idolatry? For who does not honor them in whose name he swears?" When the same logic is applied to Judaism it is apparent that the Jews performed their oaths in Yahweh's name because of their respect and fear of the one, true God.

⁴⁸⁵ Brongers, "Die Wendeung *b'šēm jhwh*," 10 and Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 27.

⁴⁸⁶ Gen. 22:16; Isa. 45:23. Tertullian says in this regard, in his *Contra Marcion* (XXVI), "But God also swears... by Himself! What was He to do, when He knew of no other God; especially when He was swearing to this very point, that besides himself there was absolutely no God?"

⁴⁸⁷ Cartledge, *Vows*, 135.

⁴⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 27.

this aspect can be seen in those cases where a person had given a vow to serve God in Temple services.

Another aspect of oaths is that God could also be called upon to be a witness to the actions sworn to—thus lending the oath a distinct legal flavor.⁴⁹⁰ In other instances vows or oaths could be petitionary prayers which were intended to secure a favorable end to an imminent crisis.⁴⁹¹ As such vows stem in part from the human inclination to deal with God as if He were a human; that is, vows could be a sort of *quid pro quo* whereby the person struck a deal with God (by vowing to do something), in order to deflect distress. Not unexpectedly then, the use of the name of another god (to secure an oath), rather than the name of YHWH (Deut. 6:13; 10:20; Jos. 23:7; Isa. 48:1) was seen as inappropriate for a Jew and prohibited by apodictic law (Jos. 23:7).

Not surprisingly, therefore, the executing of oaths in the name of a foreign god was considered to be apostasy (e.g., Jos. 23:7; Jer. 5:7; Amos 8:14 and Zeph. 1:5). In part this aversion was driven by the fact that the execution of such oaths was cultic in nature.⁴⁹² Moreover, vows in God's name by their very nature were such an integral component of Israelite piety that religious authorities felt compelled to regulate vows by the imposition of proper strictures (Deut. 23:21-23).

In summary, oaths were taken in God's name in order to insure the carrying out of the oath. This insurance came about because calling on God's name was similar to an invocation; both were designed to draw God near.⁴⁹³ By drawing God near it was thought that God would witness the oath and thus become a participant in the process.

⁴⁸⁹ Ibid., 31.

⁴⁹⁰ Friedrich Horst, "Der Eid im Alten Testament," 292.

⁴⁹¹ Ex. 5:23; Deut. 18:19, 20, 22; I Ki. 22:16; (=II Chron. 18:15); Jer. 20:9; 26:16; 29:23; 44:16; Zech. 13:3; Dan. 9:6; I Chron. 21:19; II Chron. 18:15; 33:18; and Sir. 36:20b.

⁴⁹² Brongers, "Die Wendung *b'sêm jhwh*," 17. As Brongers points out זכר in Jos. 23:7 refers to a cultic invocation of the god's name. The author admonishes his readers as follows: "...you may not associate with these nations, these which remain among you, or mention the name of their gods, or make *anyone* swear *by them*, or serve them, or bow down to them."

⁴⁹³ Of some interest in this regard is the statement of Origen (*C. Cels.* V.XLV), in a passage which we have already covered in the Greco-Roman magic section, that intimates that an oath and an invocation are similar. Origen states, "If any one, either in an invocation or in swearing an oath [emphasis mine], were to use the expression, 'the God of Abraham,' and 'the God of Isaac,' and 'the God of Jacob,' he would produce certain effects, either owing to the nature of these names or to their powers, since even demons are vanquished and become submissive to him who pronounces these names..."

PROPHESYING OR SPEAKING IN THE NAME OF GOD

The phrase **בשם דבר** occurs some 14 times in the O.T., and one time in the Apocrypha,⁴⁹⁴ while **בשם נבא** occurs roughly ten times.⁴⁹⁵ The basal meaning here must be taken to be that one speaks in the place (or authority) of the one being named, and correspondingly reports what the one being named desires, rather than proclaiming one's own message.⁴⁹⁶ It means, more pointedly, that the one who is speaking has been commissioned by the one whose name is being used as Deut. 18:18-20 (cf. Jer. 14:14, 15; 23:25; 27:15; 29:9; Ez. 13:3-9) clearly points out when God says to Moses concerning Israel that in the future He will:

‘Raise up a prophet from among their countrymen like you, and I will put My words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him. 19 ‘And it shall come about that whoever will not listen to My words which he shall speak in My name, I Myself will require it of him. 20 ‘But the prophet who shall speak a word presumptuously in My name which I have not commanded him to speak, or which he shall speak in the name of other gods, that prophet shall die.’

Here we observe that the prophesying in God's name signifies that the one prophesying speaks the very words of God; it is as if God Himself had directly spoken to His people.⁴⁹⁷

Appended to this basal meaning, at least with respect to speaking in the name of God, is that the person is presumed to be speaking in and with the Spirit of God. Furthermore, by way of extension, clearly the one who speaks in the name of God can only speak the truth (I Ki. 22:16; cf. II Chron. 18:15).

⁴⁹⁴ Ex. 5:23; Deut. 18:19,20; I Sam. 25:9; I Ki. 22:16 (=II Chron. 18:15); Jer. 20:9; 26:16; 44:16; Zach. 13:3; Dan. 9:6; I Chron. 21:19; II Chron. 33:18; *Wis. of Sir.* 36:20.

⁴⁹⁵ Jer. 11:21; 14:14,15; 23:25; 26:9, 20; 27:15; 29:9, 21; and Ezr. 5:1.

⁴⁹⁶ Pace Jacob, *ING*, 32, and Giesebrecht, *DATSGN*, 24. Rightly Grether, *NWGAT*, 23; Bietenhard, “*ἄνομα*,” 260; Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 81; Fabry, “*שם*,” 133,138; Brongers, “Die Wendung *b'sēm jhwh*,” 15; Mehlmann, *Der “Name” Gottes*, 55; and Niles *TNGIW*, 50. Jacob maintains that since the Deuteronomist steadfastly denies the existence of other divinities the phrase **בשם אלהים אחרים** can't be taken to imply that the speaker is their representative, and by extension the same must be valid for those passages where the speaker speaks in the name of God. On page 34 Jacob makes the remarkable statement that “...denn bei der Nichtexistenz anderer Götter ist es von vornherein gewiss, dass der Mann lügt und man braucht nicht erst den Erfolg abzuwarten.” In spite of the fact that Jacob assumes too much here I will, nevertheless, briefly discuss this point. First, if it so obvious to the people that the so-called false prophet has lied and was thus no prophet at all then why the urgency to admonish the people not to follow him-not to mention kill him? Second, the point here is that the person who speaks in the name of their god naturally believes that that god exists. It is not a question of whether the Deuteronomist believed in their existence, but rather of how Israel was to deal with those who did accept and follow these various gods.

⁴⁹⁷ Boehmer, *BIN*, 56.

An example of this type of logic is seen in Jer. 26: 9, where Jeremiah is condemned for prophesying against the Temple. Here the Priests accuse Jeremiah as being someone who prophesies falsely in the name of YHWH. This judgment is based upon the belief that YHWH would not, or could not, desire the destruction of His own Temple and thus, Jeremiah must be falsely prophesying in the name of YHWH. In Brongers' view, as well as mine own, this prophecy of the Temple's destruction must have been tantamount to blasphemy.⁴⁹⁸ This passage amply illustrates the idea that the true prophet of YHWH is perceived to be someone who must speak the truth because God has sent them. Of course, if the prophet indeed speaks truthfully in the name of God then the people must take care to take heed to the prophet (e.g., Dan. 9:6). Just how serious this injunction was taken can be seen in the judgment of *m San.* 11.1, where we find the statement that anyone who prophesies in the name of an idol must suffer strangulation.

Similarly, in Jer. 14:14 God decries the false prophets, who He describes as:

The prophets [who] are prophesying falsehood in My name. I have neither sent them nor commanded them nor spoken to them; they are prophesying to you a false vision, divination, futility and the deception of their own minds.

Here the basic meaning of the usage comes into particularly clear focus. Those who legitimately prophesy in the Name are those whom God has commissioned to do so.

A similar result is obtained when we consider the phrase 'to speak in the name of God'. We find, for example, that Joseph can speak to Aseneth 'in the name of the Most High God'.⁴⁹⁹ The same basic meaning can also be seen in Ex. 5:22, where God sends Moses to speak in His Name.

In summary, we can see from these various passages that to speak, or prophesy in the name of God, signified that the speaker was sent from God and that he spoke only those words that God had sanctioned. Thus, he was God's representative, standing in His place. The Name in a sense represents God. To speak in the name of God means to speak as God would want; that is, as He has commanded.

BLESS OR CURSE SOMEONE IN THE NAME OF THE GOD

A related function to invocation is the act of calling upon the Name in blessing. Within the Old Testament one finds that the proper occasion to offer a blessing, as far as humans were

⁴⁹⁸ Brongers, "Die Wendung," 16.

⁴⁹⁹ *Joseph and Aseneth*, 9.

concerned, was in either greeting another person (e.g. Ps. 129:8; Ruth 2:4), or when one presented a gift to another party (e.g. Jos. 15:19). A blessing, or likewise a curse, could be spoken, or alternatively, it could be written out on amulets and the like.⁵⁰⁰ But there were important differences, i.e. unlike a curse, people could call a blessing over themselves,⁵⁰¹ or as was the case with Abraham, a divinely appointed name could be a blessing for other people (Gen. 12:3).

A blessing could be more than a verbal act, it could also be accompanied by gestures. For example, not infrequently a blessing was accompanied by the placing of the hand upon the one being blessed,⁵⁰² or was accompanied with an uplifted hand (Lev. 9:22).⁵⁰³

Historically speaking, it appears that the basis for the view that the calling out of a blessing or a curse in the name of a divinity had a numinous effect appears to have originated in magical conceptions.⁵⁰⁴ Of greater import for my study is that the role which the divinity played in carrying out either a blessing or a curse in Semitic cultures was quite indispensable.⁵⁰⁵ We can see the impact of this clearly in those Old Testament passages that speak of blessing in the name of the God.⁵⁰⁶

Within cultic contexts, we find that the priest could bless either the people (Ps. 118:26), or the offering (I Sam. 9:13). Some have even maintained that within the Old Testament the

⁵⁰⁰Friedrich Horst, "Segen und Segenshandlungen in der Bibel," in *Gottes Recht: Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im Alten Testament*, ed. Hans Walter Wolff, (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961), 190.

⁵⁰¹*Ibid.*, 190.

⁵⁰²*Ibid.*, 191.

⁵⁰³Here the aspect of contact magic is evident as Hempel notes. See Johannes Hempel, "Die Israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte Altorientalischer Parallelen," in *APOXYSMATA: Vorarbeiten zu einer Religionsgeschichte und Theologie des Alten Testaments: Festgabe zum 30. Juli 1961* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1961), 53.

⁵⁰⁴So Hempel, Eissfeldt, and Grether. See Grether, *NWGAT*, 20; Hempel, "Die Israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte Altorientalischer Parallelen," 31-55; and Eissfeldt, "Jahwe-Name und Zauberverwesen," 155.

⁵⁰⁵For example, Pederson notes that the divinity in Assyrian curses exercised an extraordinary role. In the Assyrian pantheon a lower god would swear by a greater god in order to apply the power of the greater god to the carrying out of the oath. See Johs Pederson, *Der Eid bei Den Semiten in seinem Verhältnis zu Verwandten Erscheinungen sowie die Stellung des Eides im Islam* (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1914), 155, 158.

⁵⁰⁶See Num. 6:27; Dt.10:8; 21:5; II Sam. 6:18 (=I Chron. 16:2); Ps. 118:26; 129:8; I Chron. 16: 2; 23:13; Sir. 45:15d; *Joseph and Aseneth* 19:8.

blessing of the people in the name of God formed the highpoint and goal of cultic actions.⁵⁰⁷ Certainly the blessing closed the cultic meal, as well as opened the ritual where the first-born was offered to God.⁵⁰⁸

Now within the Old Testament the *locus classicus* for the priestly blessing is found in Num. 6:22-27, where Moses is commanded by God to speak to Aaron and the people and say:

Then the LORD spoke to Moses, saying, 23 "Speak to Aaron and to his sons, saying, 'Thus you shall bless the sons of Israel. You shall say to them: 24 The LORD bless you, and keep you; 25 The LORD make His face shine on you, And be gracious to you; 26 The LORD lift up His countenance on you, And give you peace.' 27 "So they shall invoke My name on the sons of Israel, and I then will bless them."

At first blush this passage does not appear to raise significant issues but this impression is misplaced. The difficulties lay in the phrase *וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ אֶת־שְׁמִי עַל*, a term which is not elsewhere attested to, either in the Old Testament,⁵⁰⁹ or in related literature and inscriptions.⁵¹⁰ This lack of comparative material led De Boer to describe this passage as "an erratic boulder, a sliver from a divine statue of Israel's ancient existence."⁵¹¹

The issue here is whether the phrase should be taken in the manner in which Jerome understood it; that is, as *invocare nomen super*, or as simply placing the name (metaphorically) upon someone or something, much as one might do on a stele. This latter conception carries with it the notion of remembrance. The first interpretation is more attractive, however, because as we shall shortly see, it suggests the notion of ownership and protection. It also suggests that the Name is invoked, and thus it insured the presence of God. Accordingly, this explanation is to be preferred.

Whatever the true state of affairs, the placing of the Name over the people was more than simple symbolism. To the contrary, this passage seems to intimate that the Name offered some

⁵⁰⁷ Horst, "Segen und Segenshandlungen in der Bibel," 190.

⁵⁰⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁰⁹ P.A.H. De Boer, "Numbers VI 27," in *Vetus Testamentum* XXXII, I (1982): 6.

⁵¹⁰ Ibid., 11.

⁵¹¹ Ibid., 13.

protection itself, or at least it guaranteed the protection of God to those who had the Name called out over them.⁵¹²

In all of these cases the Name functioned both as the source of authority, as well as the reference of, or to, the One who had the power to effect the blessing.⁵¹³ It even could be viewed as the actual source of power in certain select cases.⁵¹⁴

Beyond this, when the Priest blessed the people during Festivals the authority of the Name granted to the priest the position of standing in God's place.⁵¹⁵ This situation is analogous to when a judge passed judgment in the name of the King. Thus, the invoking of the name of an authority, when coupled with its use by an authorized person, passes the authority belonging to the one being invoked to the one doing the invoking.

On other fronts the curse of Elisha, found in II Kings 2: 23-24, is of great interest. In what is perhaps the earliest Jewish example of a malediction, Elisha, in the story of the tormenting children who taunted him by calling him 'baldy,' turns toward them in anger and curses them (בשם יהוה) Immediately thereafter two bears appear from the woods and kill the children. This story reflects, I believe, that the author of this text held that the Name had numinous power.⁵¹⁶ This narrative is also, in my opinion, the one place in the Old Testament that seems to display unmistakable name-magic as a backdrop to the narrative.⁵¹⁷

⁵¹²Grether, *NWGAT*, 20.

⁵¹³*Pace* Boehmer, *BIN*, 56. Boehmer believes that the Name is really the subject of the blessing. With specific reference to the notion of blessing in the Name Boehmer goes so far as to state that "בשם בריך בשם...hier ist Gottes Name nicht das Mittel oder Kraft, womit gesegnet und geflucht wird, sondern Gottes Name selber ist es, der segnet und flucht, Gottes Name ist das Subjekt des Segnens und Fluchens." See, *BIN*, 56-57. I fail to see the rationale for this proposition. I think the evidence demonstrates that the use of the Name in an oath is really similar to an invocation. The god is called upon to witness and secure the oath. His or her presence, secured via invocation, made the divinity a participant in the oath. Cf. Pederson, *Der Eid*, 158, 161.

⁵¹⁴So Farby, "שם," 132; Mehlmann, *Der "Name" Gottes*, 76; Brongers, "Die Wendung," 8; and Horst "Segen," 192.

⁵¹⁵Jacob, *ING*, 3. This interpretation is given in spite of the fact that Jacob believes that ordinarily the phrase 'in the name of someone' does not carry the meaning a representation. See pg. 4.

⁵¹⁶*Pace* Jacob. This particular story provides the rebuttal to Jacob who believes that the Name was never viewed as a numinous object. Here, the malediction carries strong numinous, even magical overtones, as Eissfeldt pointed out. For further reading see Eissfeldt, "Jahwe-Name und Zaubrerwesen," 150-152, 154; as well as Jacobs, *ING*, 18, 48, 64.

⁵¹⁷Mehlmann, *Der "Name" Gottes*, 78. I fail to understand Brongers' conclusion in this matter that the use of the divine Name in this curse has no magical overtones whatsoever. He maintains that this passage is more in the

HEALING IN THE NAME OF GOD

At first blush we might suspect that the perception that God's name could bring healing would be completely restricted to non-literary sources, but this is not the case. Within the O.T. certain vestiges of this belief are traceable. For example, in the story concerning the healing of Naaman the leper (II Kings 5:1-14), the prophet Elisha instructs Naaman to go and wash himself in the River Jordan seven times. Naaman's response reveals something interesting. The text reads (v.11):

But Naaman was furious and went away and said, Behold, I thought, He will surely come out to me, and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, and wave his hand over the place, and cure the leper.

Here we find possible evidence of the use of God's name to perform healings. However, it must be said that this passage must be used with some caution.⁵¹⁸ The view of Naaman is cited, not per se, that of Elisha. However, as we have already seen in the story of Elijah cursing the children in the name of God, and his use of the Name at Mount Carmel in his confrontation with the priests of Baal, the Name was used by Elijah in a fashion which suggests that the author thought that the Name had a numinous power all its own. A similar line of thought may stand behind the Elisha narratives also. Naaman should be understood as reacting from previous knowledge of how Jewish prophets acted in similar cases. In any event, this remains an *argumentum e silentio* and should not be pushed any further.

A similarly suggestive situation arises when we review the story of the raising of the widow's son by Elijah (I Kings 17:20-22). In the narrative Elijah is said to have lain over the boy's body and "called to [invoked] the Lord (ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν κύριον)." Unlike the previous

nature of a prayer, and God's fulfillment of the curse was necessitated because the ridicule of the children (that Elisha was bald), also denigrates God! It is hard to see how this curse constitutes a formal prayer, how the teasing of Elisha by the children for a bald spot insults God, or more importantly why God would answer it unless the author saw God as bound by the use of His Name—a clearly magical conception. Brongers' claim that God acted because His honor was a stake, in addition to Elisha's, is hard to swallow. Just how God's honor was besmirched when the children were teasing Elisha about his baldness remains unclear. And it strikes me as untenable to suggest that God would send bears to maul to death the children based solely on some childhood teasing. Other prophets have been both mistreated and literally terrorized (e.g., I Kings 18:13; 19:1-5 cf. Lk. 11:47-51; Acts 7: 52); indeed it is almost a hallmark for the Old Testament prophets, yet in none of these cases do we witness God acting to uphold 'His' honor in a manner even remotely similar to what we see in this passage. I think the rejection of magical overtones is fueled by purely apologetic motives by those who wish to preserve the Old Testament as untainted by such magical thinking. For Brongers' views see "Die Wendung *b'sēm jhwh*," 10.

⁵¹⁸ Nägelsbach does not appear to be willing to see any chance here that the name of YHWH was seen as a source of power. He contends that the very expression יהוה בשם is not even a formulaic expression. See, *DNGJHS*, 23.

example, here it is clear that Elijah invoked God in order to raise the widow's son from the dead. In this narrative it is clear that the invocation of God insured that God would be present and heal the child.

Another piece of evidence can be gleaned from II Kings 1:1-17. In the narrative Ahaziah had suffered a grievous injury when he fell through the lattice of his room. Seeking a miracle cure, Ahaziah send messengers to consult Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron. According to the narrative YHWH sends His angel to Elijah and commands that Elijah confront the delegation from Ahaziah and state:

'Is it because there is no God in Israel that you are going off to consult Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron?' ⁴ Therefore this is what the LORD says: 'You will not leave the bed you are lying on. You will certainly die!'

Standing behind this narrative is evidently the belief that YHWH could have healed Ahaziah had he only prayed to Him. Of course, this does not necessarily mean that God's name would have been invoked, but at the least the entire story is suggestive that only YHWH could heal and this in turn suggests that YHWH was invoked to bring about the healing.

Further evidence can be gathered from the Jewish exorcists spoken of in Acts 19. Here we find indisputable evidence that Jewish exorcists used what they thought was an apotropaic name in their exorcisms. I have already pointed out that in the Ancient World illness was widely assumed to be caused by demons and therefore one can conclude that these exorcists were invoking apotropaic names which resulted in certain cases with a healing.

Taken altogether these various narratives lend credence to the notion that Jews prior to the dawn of the New Testament era believed that the use of the name of God in invocation had certain salutary effects in producing healings and the like.

WRITING OF THE DIVINE NAME

One of the most remarkable features concerning the divine name was the special scribal treatment afforded the Tetragrammaton. This treatment involved writing the divine name in some specific manner so as to differentiate it from the surrounding text. The nature of this treatment was variegated and there appears to have been no conventionalized method of signifying the Name's sacred nature. Still, some techniques were more prevalent than others.

In some texts, for example, the Name was written in sacred characters (e.g. paleo-Hebrew script), a practice perhaps derived from Egyptian practice. Josephus, in his narrative about the

vesturing of the High Priest gives us some indication of this practice when he discusses the nature of the priestly diadem and describes it in the following manner:

This calyx...did not cover the forehead, but it was covered with a golden plate, which had inscribed upon it the name of God in sacred characters. And such were the ornaments of the high priest.⁵¹⁹

It is of interest to note that the use of paleo-Hebrew characters is attested to in the Qumran documents. Following Stegemann I note the following scrolls in which the Divine Name is recorded in archaic script: 2QExb=2Q3 and 3QThreni=3Q3 (Bible citations without commentary); 4QpIs^a=4Q161, 1QpMichah=1Q14, 1QpHab, 1QpZech=1Q15 and 4QpPs^a=4Q171 (Peshar texts); 1Qps^b=1Q 11 and 11Qps^a (apocryphal Psalms).⁵²⁰

Rather striking is Stegemann's paleographic dating for this practice, which suggests that it first arose in Hellenistic Judaism in the Second Century B.C.E. Stegemann concludes that "Dieser Befund zeigt, daß die Sitte althebräischer Tetragramm-Wiedergabe in einem nicht althebräisch geschriebenen Kontext gar nicht auf palästinischem Boden erwachsen ist."⁵²¹

This important observation demonstrates that the same scribal scruples regarding the special treatment of the divine name existed among Hellenistic Jews, as well as their Palestinian cousins, and that the practice was already established well before the advent of the Christian Era.

Other devices employed to signify the singularly sacred nature of the divine name include the later practice of writing the Tetragrammaton in gold letters;⁵²² placing the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew within a Greek copy of the Old Testament, rendering the Name with special modifications such as 'zz' with a line drawn through it, or four points,⁵²³ or separating the Name from its surrounding text by extra spaces before and after the Name.

The import of this practice is rather clear. It was the scribal method of signifying that the divine name was sacred above all other names. Just as speaking out the divine name was

⁵¹⁹ *AJ* 3.178. Cf. *Letter of Aristeas* 98.

⁵²⁰ Harmut Stegemann, "Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten," in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium XLVI, eds. Matthais. Delcor et. al., (Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1978), 206 fn. 38.

⁵²¹ *Ibid.*, 207.

⁵²² So Josephus, *AJ* 12.2.10; possibly the *Letter of Aristeas* 176; and bTalmud. *Shabbath* 103b.

⁵²³ Bruce M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Palaeography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 33-35 and Colin H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 31.

prohibited, in time its written form became just as sacred, and guarded, as the spoken form. In my section dealing with the New Testament I shall return to this topic and discuss in greater depth the significance of this phenomenon.

THE CALLING OR PLACING OF THE NAME OVER SOMEONE OR SOMETHING

This phrase reflects a legal formulation⁵²⁴ designed to signify that the object or person over whom the name is invoked is the possession of the bearer of the name,⁵²⁵ and the phrase is always in the passive (e.g., κτῆ and ἐπικέκληται respectively).⁵²⁶ This phrase is so formulaic in nature that it could also be extended to such cases as when a general conquered a city and would have his name named over it in order to signify his ownership.⁵²⁷ In a similar vein, in Ps. 49: 12, we find the statement that the Gentiles call their lands after themselves-no doubt to indicate their ownership.

This concept also stands in the foreground in places such as Isaiah 4: 1, where the text relates the prophetic fate of Jerusalem in a situation where it is said that during the day of calamity seven women will call on the same man to be their husband. The women say, "We will eat our own bread and wear our own clothes, only let us be called by your name (LXX τὸ ὄνομα τὸ σὸν κεκλησθῶ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς); take away our reproach!" Here, clearly in desperation, the women entice the man to become wedded by promising that they would not be an economic hardship. This relationship is signified by the man's name being called out over the women. Given this context it is significant that the name of YHWH is called out over Jerusalem (Dan. 9:18, LXX; τῆς πόλεως σου, ἐφ' ἧς ἐπεκληθή τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐπ' αὐτῆς), as well as cult objects (i.e., the Ark. See II Sam. 6:2 and I Chron. 13:6).

⁵²⁴So Mettinger, "The Dethronement," 39.

⁵²⁵So also Mettinger, *ibid*; Kurt Gallig, "Die Ausrufung des Namens als Rechtsakt in Israel," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* Nummer 2, 81Jahrgang, Februar 1956: 65-70; Friedrich Nötscher, "Epiklese in biblischer Beleuchtung," 222; McBride, *The Deuteronomic Name Theology*, 216 fn. 33, 35; Farby, "𐤁𐤍," 142; Brongers, "Die Wendung *b'sem jhwh*," 13; Mehlmann, *Der "Name" Gottes*, 43; Nägelsbach, *DNGJHS*, 62; Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 25; and Shalom M. Paul, *Amos: A Commentary on the Book of Amos*, ed. Frank Moore Cross, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 292. Gallig, it should be observed, offers several illustrations of this phenomenon in Assyrian, Sumerian, and Greek law. See pgs. 67-68.

⁵²⁶Nötscher, "Epiklese," 222.

⁵²⁷Jacob, *ING*, 12, 15. See Farby, "𐤁𐤍," 146.

One of the more prominent applications in this respect is the claim that the Temple had the Name called over it (e.g., I Ki. 8:43; Jer. 7:11, 14, 30; 32:34; 34:15; I Ki. 8:43; II Chron. 6:33). This calling of the Name over the Temple meant not only that the place belonged to YHWH, but that it was set apart to and for Him, and was an authorized cult site in which YHWH could be found.

It is worth further considering that ownership claims could also apply to the people of Israel (e.g. Deut. 28: 1; Ecclesiastes 47:18; Isaiah 63: 19; Jer. 14: 9; Dan. 9: 19; and II Macc. 8: 15). More pointedly, when the Name was called out over Israel it signified their selection for salvation.⁵²⁸ These are the ones chosen by God and counted worthy to bear His Name and receive His salvation. This owner or property relationship is nowhere more emphatically expressed than in the relationship between YHWH and his people. In Isaiah 63:19 (cf. II Chron. 7:14; Deut. 28:10), it states that Israel belongs to YHWH and has been called by His name (LXX ἐπεκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς). We read again in Jeremiah 14: 9, "You [God] are indeed in our midst and your Name is called over us." Similar sentiments are echoed in Amos 9: 12, where the nations conquered by David are said to be those over whom the name of God had been called (LXX, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπ' αὐτούς), again signifying ownership.⁵²⁹

In another capacity the calling of the Name over a person or object signified that they were set apart for the purposes set forth by the discretion of God. We know already that calling the Name over someone or something designated the person or object as YHWH's possession, but there is a flipside; that is, that this possession meant that the person or object was wholly devoted to Him alone.⁵³⁰ This sanctification of objects, especially those objects dedicated to cultic activities, is seen clearly in II Sam. 6:2, where the Ark of the Covenant is described as "the ark of God which is called by the Name, who is enthroned above the cherubim."⁵³¹ Here the

⁵²⁸ Mehlmann, *Der "Name" Gottes*, 63. As an example Ps Sol. 9:9 reads, "For you chose the descendants of Abraham above all the nations and you put your name upon us, Lord."

⁵²⁹ Paul, *Amos*, 19 and Farby, "𐤀𐤓," 147.

⁵³⁰ So Heitmüller, *INJ*, 171; Jacob, *ING*, 12; Giesebrecht, *DNGJHS*, 22; and Grether, *NWGAT*, 25. Grether believes, as do I, that the practice of invoking the name over someone can be traced from prior magical conceptions. See pg. 20.

⁵³¹ This passage is notorious for the difficulties that it presents. Chief among these is the duplication of the divine name within the narrative. The second reference to the Name is an apparent example of dittography. This

meaning is not so much that of ownership alone, but rather the cultic act of calling out the name of YHWH over the Ark during cultic activities.⁵³² In somewhat similar fashion Josephus claims that when an object or person had the name of a god called over it the object or person then became dedicated to the affairs of the god.⁵³³

A related area to calling the name over someone is that of tattooing names upon a person. Passages which reflect this theme include Isa. 44:5. Here we read of a ritual sign being written upon the hand of the believer (i.e. 'Belonging to the Lord'). This sign no doubt signals, among other things, that the bearer of the mark belonged to YHWH.⁵³⁴ Here the name is not called out over the person, but rather directly placed upon the person. It is this connection between name and possession which also lies behind passages such as Lev. 19:28, 21:5, and Deut. 14:1, which prohibit the practice of tattooing the names or siglas of foreign gods. Heitmüller summarizes this relationship as it is found in the Old Testament as:

Zegehörigkeit zu Jahve, innege Vereinigung mit ihm, seinen Segen und Schutz bedeutet es, wenn Jahves Name über einer Person oder einen Gegenstand genannt wird, eine ähnliche Bedeutung hat der Jahve-Name als Stigma.⁵³⁵

A final aspect of this use that I mentioned earlier is that of "placing" (םש) of the Name over the people when the High Priest blesses the people (Num. 6:27). Here the Name is called over the people to bless them and to seal them, so to speak. Derived in part from this conception is the complementary notion that the calling of the Name over someone afforded him or her the protection of God.⁵³⁶

observation is reinforced by the absence of the duplicated 'shem' in the parallel account of I Chron. 13:5, as well as its absence from the text of the LXX. Compare, however, the arguments of Hans Joachim Stoebe, *Das zweite Buch Samuelis*, (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1994), 188.

⁵³² So Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 128.

⁵³³ *AJ* 4.207; 16.45. Within the non-canonical literature of the Intertestamental Era we find the continuation of this aspect of the name-concept. In a passage in 2 Esd 4:22-25, a passage dealing with cultic activity, it is stated that the Name was invoked over the Torah faithful:

I implore you, my lord, why have I been endowed with the power of understanding? 23 For I did not wish to inquire about the ways above...[but] why Israel has been given over to the Gentiles in disgrace... 24 We pass from the world like locusts, and our life is like a mist, and we are not worthy to obtain mercy. 25 But what will he do for his Name that is invoked over us? (Cf. *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 49:7).

⁵³⁴ See Heitmüller, *INJ*, 174. Interestingly, Heitmüller sees the mark of Cain in the same light. See pg. 174.

⁵³⁵ *Ibid.*, 175.

In summary then, calling the name of God over someone or something meant that the person or object belonged to God and was now dedicated to God's service. The corollary to this was that those who had the name called out over them were themselves called out by the god to be a person devoted to fulfilling the purposes of God. Furthermore, those who are called by YHWH will receive His salvation and are assured of His protection.

'KNOWING' THE NAME OF GOD

Another action concerning the Name involved 'knowing' it, or as the case may be in the negative, not forgetting the Name. It is said in Isa. 64:2 that the people of God desire that God would make His name known to His enemies. Here the thought of impressing a hostile power that Israel's God is supreme lies at the door. Of similar interest is 1 Mac 4:33, where the author states, "Strike them down with the sword of those who love you, and let all who know your Name praise you with hymns." Unlike the previous example, here we encounter the thought of community coherence; that is, all worshippers of YHWH are defined as those who know His name.

In an eschatological context, it is said that on the Day of God's visitation Israel itself would come to know the Name because God will make His name known (Jer. 16:21; Ez. 39:7 and Isa. 52:6). This knowledge stands in contrast to the goal of the false prophets, who intend through their prophecies to cause the name of YHWH to be forgotten. This claim is found, for example, in Jer. 23:26-27, where the author states:

I have heard what the prophets have said who prophesy falsely in My name, saying, I had a dream, I had a dream ...even these prophets of the deception of their own heart, who intend to make My people forget My name by their dreams which they relate to one another, just as their fathers forgot My name because of Baal?

This passage is quite interesting in terms of community dynamics and religious self-identification. Here, the author's intent is to remind the true worshippers of YHWH that they should not exchange the glory of God, or His name, for the names of foreign gods.

Now in Ps. 44:20-21 we see the same concerns which drove Jeremiah, but with an additional element on display, viz. the notion that (in this context) the Name and God could be seen as synonyms. The Psalmist writes, albeit in an antithetical fashion that:

If we had forgotten the name of our God,

⁵³⁶ Heitmüller, *INJ*, 142 and Nötscher, "Epiklese," 223. See Heitmüller here for rabbinic texts which claim this function.

Or extended our hands to a strange god;
Would not God find this out?
For He knows the secrets of the heart.

Here forgetting the Name signifies falling out of relationship and obedience to God.

Concretely then, 'forgetting' the Name, or 'knowing' the Name, had two facets. The first is that the Name represented God; it was a symbol for Him. In this context it could be used to symbolically represent a relationship with God. To 'know' the Name meant that the person knew God, while 'forgetting' the Name meant that a person had turned away from a relationship to God. Here, as elsewhere, the Name stands as a *symbolon* for God Himself and for His covenantal relationship.

BEARING THE NAME OF SOMEONE

The phenomenon under review here entails the action whereby one is called (i.e. named) by the name of someone; that is, the person bears another's name. We see this phenomenon in *Ps. Philo* 28.4, where God describes Israel as His chosen plant among the populated world (i.e. the "great vineyard"), which God would call "by My Name."

This passage makes clear that the people of God, those whom He had chosen, are to be called by His name. We see another example of this phenomenon in Isa. 43:7, where the author places in the mouth of God this statement concerning a definition of His people; they are "Everyone who is called by My name. And [those] whom I have created for My glory."

This concept means that in effect the owner's name becomes their name too. Unlike similar expressions, which connote only that the person belongs to, or subscribes to, a particular point of view (e.g. Herodians), in these Old Testament cases the use signifies something much more profound-viz., that the person, group or object *belongs* to God and has been chosen by Him to receive His salvation.

In an interesting juxtaposition of the theme of acting for the sake of the Name and being called by the Name, *II Esdras* (4: 24-25) states that Ezra asks God about why Israel has undergone so many tribulations and then asks, in less than rhetorical fashion, "But what will he do for His name, by which we are called?" The first part of this passage refers to God's reputation (=His name) but the latter portion is meant to convey that the persons so named belong to, and are dependent upon, the person whose name they now bear. A related aspect is found in Jeremiah 15:15-16, where the prophet importunes God for His attention, as well as His

protection, and claims that God should respond to him for he has borne the Name. The passage reads:

Thou who knowest, O LORD,
Remember me, take notice of me,
And take vengeance for me on my persecutors.
Do not, in view of Thy patience, take me away;
Know that for Thy sake I endure reproach.
16 Thy words were found and I ate them,
And Thy words became for me a joy and the delight of my heart;
For I have been called by Thy name,
O LORD God of hosts.

This usage signifies that to bear the name of God means to be called by Him, to belong to, and finally, to serve Him. It also means that God knows the people that are called by His name.

In summary, to bear someone's name means that the object or person belongs to the person that they are named after. This usage also means, in the context of YHWH worship, that the person knows YHWH and serves Him.

'WALKING' IN THE NAME

An interesting passage which applies this type of language is found in Micah 4:5, where we read:

Though all the peoples walk,
Each in the name of his god,
As for us, we will walk
In the name of the LORD our God (יִלְכּוּ בִשְׁמֵי־הֵיחָד אֱלֹהֵינוּ) forever and ever.

The meaning of the passage is that religious conventicles are defined by the name of the divinity in which they walk; that is, the name by which they come into contact with their god, as well as signifying their adherence to the religious code prescribed by their faith system.⁵³⁷ This sense of going in the way of God (i.e., following God's commandments) is demonstrated in the rendering of this passage by the LXX. Here, the LXX uses the phrase, πορευσόμεθα ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν. This sense is again highlighted in verse 4:2, where the author states concerning the path for those who worship God:

And many nations will come and say,

⁵³⁷ As Brongers observes, the core meaning appears to be to serve or to worship the divinities that a group believes in. This of course would entail following the religious scruples set down by the priests and prophets. For more see Brongers, "Die Wendung *b'sēm jhwh*," 5.

Come and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD...
That He may teach us about His ways
And that we may walk in His paths...

The reference here to walking in God's path is similar in meaning to the expression 'to walk in the name of God.'

Another passage that offers the same sense is Zech. 10:12, where God speaks of the gathering of the Diaspora Jews. The text ends with this promise, "And I shall strengthen them in the LORD, and in His name they will walk."

Yet another similar expression is found in Ps.-Philo 21.10, where Joshua blesses the people and then exclaims his hope that the people "do not depart [walk away] from His name." Here the meaning is similar to the expression 'going' (i.e., walking) in the name of God.

What needs to be underscored is that those people who follow their respective gods will proceed and carry out their lives and religious obligations in the names of their gods, thus they carry out their lives in close relationship to their gods.⁵³⁸ For Jews, the chosen and covenant-bound people of God, it is mandated that they walk only in His name; just as non-Jews walk in the names of their gods. This great Name distinguished, in part, the people of God from the nations. Of course this adherence carries all sorts of particular religious obligations, e.g., rites and cultus, religious scruples, etc., all of which were to be carried out in the power and authority of the Name.

PRAISING, BLESSING, THANKING OR GLORIFYING THE NAME

It is a noteworthy fact that the Israelites were enjoined to make the name of God great,⁵³⁹ to bless it,⁵⁴⁰ as well as honor the Name; for God Himself desires that His name be glorified and sanctified.⁵⁴¹ This elevation of the Name was predicated upon the fact that the Name itself is holy and excellent.⁵⁴² Indeed, it could be claimed that the name of the Lord was equal to His

⁵³⁸ Boehmer correctly draws attention to this close relationship but fails to note the fact that an additional facet is in view, viz. that the person not only lives in close relationship with their god, but also that they fulfill the obligations mandated by the god. That is to say, it expresses the notion that one lives faithfully within the moral strictures, as well as the prescribed ritual and cultic behavior of their religion. For Boehmer's take on this expression see *BIN*, 61.

⁵³⁹ E.g., Ps. 34:3; Isa. 24:15.

⁵⁴⁰ *Jubilees* 45:4; *Joseph and Aseneth* 19:8.

⁵⁴¹ E.g., Mal. 2:2; Isa. 29: 23 and in a similar vein Mal. 3:16.

mighty works.⁵⁴³ Furthermore, several passages maintain an association between the praise of God and His Name, thus establishing that the Name serves as a surrogate for God Himself.⁵⁴⁴ Given this, it is natural that the faithful were commanded to “Ascribe majesty to His name” (*Sir.* 39:15).

The connection between praising the Name and praising God is clearly seen in several passages. In Ps. 66:4, for example, the Psalmist calls for Israel to sing to the Name, and as a result they glorify God (“All the earth will worship Thee, and will sing praises to Thee; They will sing praises to Thy name”). In Ps. 69:31 we read, “I will praise the name of God with song, And shall magnify Him with thanksgiving.” Again, this time in Dt. 32:3, we find this expression of praise, “For I proclaim the name of the LORD; Ascribe greatness to our God!” And David, in his Psalm of Praise in II Sam. 22:50 says, “Therefore I will give thanks to Thee. O Lord, among the nations, and I will sing praises to Thy name,”⁵⁴⁵ while Ex.9: 16 states that the Lord told Moses that His name was to be proclaimed in the entire world. This command comes during the confrontation between God and the Egyptian Pharaoh-and the world power that he represented. Hence, the Name would represent the fame of God as a world conqueror; that is, as the Lord of all the earth.⁵⁴⁶ In general, we see that the usage signifies that through the proclaiming of His name God Himself is exalted.⁵⁴⁷ Thus this passage is related to those passages which speak of praising the Name.

It is reasonably clear from the parallelism between God’s name and God in these passages that the act of praising the Name was the same as praising God.⁵⁴⁸ This powerful cultic

⁵⁴² E.g. Ps. 111:9; 148:13.

⁵⁴³ *Sir.* 2:17, “Let us fall into the hands of the Lord, but not into the hands of mortals; for equal to his majesty is his mercy, and equal to his Name are his works.”

⁵⁴⁴ E.g., Ps. 48:11; 72:17; 102: 22. This relationship between praising, blessing, or singing to the Name as one of surrogacy is endorsed by Brongers too. See, “Die Wendung *b’šēm jhwh*,” 16.

⁵⁴⁵ Cf. Ps. 18:49 and Ps. Sol. 6.4.

⁵⁴⁶ Farby, “*יְהוָה*,” 140.

⁵⁴⁷ So, Mehlmann, *Der “Name” Gottes*, 72.

⁵⁴⁸ Niles quotes H.-J. Kraus approvingly in this regard. See, Niles, *TNGIW*, 173. So too, Grether, *NWGAT*,

act was performed in the congregation and was designed to ‘magnify’ YHWH.⁵⁴⁹ Furthermore, we should call to mind that Niles has convincingly argued that this cultic act of proclaiming God’s name is a type of invocation.

In similar fashion the Name could be ‘thanked’ and it is clear from several passages that the Name was used interchangeably for God. For example, the Psalmist responsible for Ps. 106:47 importunes God to gather in the people in order that they might praise His name. The text reads, “Save us, O LORD our God, and gather us from among the nations, that we may give thanks to your holy name and glory in your praise.” This passage makes it clear that in thanking the Name the Israelite was thanking God Himself. In essence, to praise the Name was to praise God and to thank the Name was to thank God.

One way to glorify God was to recount His deeds of glory. The connection between proclaiming the name of God and His deeds is seen in several passages in the Psalms. For example, Ps. 105:1 reads, “Oh give thanks to the LORD, call upon [proclaim] His name; Make known His deeds among the peoples.” This same theme is sounded again in Is. 12:4, where we read:

And in that day you will say, “Give thanks to the LORD, call on His name.
Make known His deeds among the peoples; Make them remember that His name is exalted.”

Another passage, Ps. 22:22, draws upon this same motif when it states, “I will tell [אֶפְתָּח; *BHS*, ‘recount’] of Thy name to my brethren; In the midst of the assembly I will praise Thee.” Once again, this time in Ps. 102:22, we hear of ‘recounting’ or ‘declaring’ the name of God in the context of praising God by an afflicted worshipper who desires, “That men may tell of the name of the LORD in Zion, And His praise in Jerusalem.” Other passages, such as Ps. 106:47, beg God to gather in the people in order that they might praise His name. The text reads, “Save us, O LORD our God, and gather us from among the nations, that we may give thanks to your holy name and glory in your praise.”

In the LXX we read, at Ps. 65:2, that the people should ψάλατε δὴ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, δότε δόξαν αἰνέσει αὐτοῦ. When we compare this to Ps. 67:5, where we see the clear placement of the Name and God in parallel fashion, this assures us that the Name is a *symbolon* for God Himself. We read that:

⁵⁴⁹ Ibid., 172.

ᾄσατε τῷ θεῷ, ψάλατε τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, ὁδοποιήσατε τῷ ἐπιβεβηκότι ἐπὶ
δυσμῶν, κύριος ὄνομα αὐτῷ... (Sing to God, sing praise to his name, extol him who rides on
the clouds-his name is the LORD; NIV translation)

This later citation demonstrates rather clearly that the Name was not seen as some sort of hypostasis in these cases, but rather that it served only as a *symbolon* for God. Here the Name is not being invoked, nor is the action of the verb carried out with respect to the accompanying circumstances of the verb (Grether's expression), but rather the action of the verb is related to the Name in the same manner as the verbs are ordinarily related to YHWH Himself-the Name symbolizes and stands in for God Himself.⁵⁵⁰ It is clear that in the context of thanksgiving, the Name and God could be used interchangeably.

Beyond this, it should be noted that the Israelite even importuned God to perform deeds and services for the sake (לְמַעַן) of the Name.⁵⁵¹ In the broader context the petition to God to act for the sake of His name is given when Israel, or an individual, had entered upon troubled times and felt abandoned by God. These circumstances prompted Israel, or the individual, to honor the special revealed Name that God had revealed to Israel.⁵⁵² That God's honor was at stake should not be in doubt for even God Himself is claimed to act on account of his honor, as Isa. 48:10-11 (cf. Eze. 20:44) makes clear:

For my name's sake I defer my anger,
for the sake of my praise I restrain it for you,
so that I may not cut you off.
See, I have refined you, but not like silver;
I have tested you in the furnace of adversity.
For my own sake, for my own sake, I do it,
for why should my name be profaned?
My glory I will not give to another.

By way of summary, it is clear that passages which speak of praising or thanking the Name employ the Name as a surrogate for God. Finally, I note the conclusion of Tournay, who has rather well captured the sense of these 'celebrations' of the Name:

⁵⁵⁰ Grether, *NWGAT*, 39.

⁵⁵¹ Or in order to facilitate praise for the Name. E.g., Jer. 13:11; 14: 7, 21; Ez. 14:22; 20:9; 20:44; 39:25; Isa. 48:9; 55:13; 59:19; Ps. 48:11; 72: 19; 102:16; 106: 47; Neh. 9:15; Ps. Sol. 11:8.

⁵⁵² Niles, *TNGIW*, 181.

...chaque fois qu'il [i.e., the Name] est prononcé et célébré, le Nom divin «redit»--c'est-à-dire qu'il exprime et révèle—la «gloire» invisible, supra-céleste et transcendante, de Celui qu'il désigne, le Dieu d'Israël, et plus précisément sa «majesté».⁵⁵³

REJOICE IN THE NAME

The phrases **בשם התפאר** and **בשם התהלל** occur rarely within the Old Testament and when found they are located exclusively in the Psalms.⁵⁵⁴ Outside of the Canon they occur once in Sirach,⁵⁵⁵ and once in *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 6:18. Jacobs explains these verses as implying that the people did not actually rejoice in the Name,⁵⁵⁶ but rather that the joyous speech begins with and is governed by the word YHWH.⁵⁵⁷ Although I do not find fault with Jacob's conclusion, I think that this expression means much more to rejoice in the Lord: an interpretation very much in line with my earlier conclusion concerning the command to sing to the Name. In both cases, the Name serves as a representative of God. Essentially, to rejoice in the name of God meant to rejoice in God Himself. This view is reinforced by noting that Isa. 41:16 and Ps. 34:2 (34:3 in the *BHS*) are ruled by the same verb but with this activity directed toward YHWH.⁵⁵⁸ Accordingly, these passages make it clear that the Name is once again a *symbolon* for YHWH Himself, and His salvific actions which result in joy among His people.

TO LOVE THE NAME OF GOD

In Psalm 5:11 (*BHS* 5:12) we find a description of those who worship YHWH as those who "love Thy Name (אֶהְבֶּה שְׁמֶךָ)."⁵⁵⁹ Here the meaning seems clear enough, viz. that the Name stands here as a representative for YHWH Himself and to love the Name thus signifies that the

⁵⁵³ R. Tournay, "Le Psaume VIII et La Doctrine Biblique du Nom," *Revue Biblique* 78 (1971): 24-25.

⁵⁵⁴ Ps. 89:16 and 105:3.

⁵⁵⁵ *Sir.* 50:20d.

⁵⁵⁶ Certainly, the thought of the preposition **ב** serving an instrumental purpose is not in view here.

⁵⁵⁷ Jacob, *ING*, 36.

⁵⁵⁸ Isa. 41:16 reads:

You shall winnow them and the wind shall carry them away,
and the tempest shall scatter them.
Then you shall rejoice in the LORD;
in the Holy One of Israel you shall glory.

Ps. 34:2 reads, "O magnify the LORD with me, and let us exalt his name together."

⁵⁵⁹ Cf. Ps. 119:132.

person also loves YHWH.⁵⁶⁰ This connection between loving the Name and loving God is also seen in the Psalms (69:36), where the claim is made that God will save Zion and rebuild it and those who love His Name will inherit the Land. The passage reads:

For God will save Zion and build the cities of Judah,
That they may dwell there and possess it.
And the descendants of His servants will inherit it,
And those who love His name will dwell in it.

And according to Isa. 56:6, the proselytes who come to God are described as those who love the name of the Lord.

We can see that the name of God stands of course for God Himself, but it also represents His salvific actions which engender devotion on the part of the adherent. It represents His glory and love on the part of the people for His revelation.

TO FEAR OR RESPECT THE NAME

This command occurs in Isa. 59:19; Ps. 61:5; 86:11; and 102:15. The word is usually *יָרָא* and it can mean not only fear but also awe or dread. Now according to the author of the Deutero-Isaiah portion of Isaiah (59:19) God will cause His name to be feared in the Day when His redeemer will appear. According to the belief of the Psalmist, those who fear the Name have an inheritance which awaits them. The Psalmist says at 61:5, "...O God; Thou hast given me the inheritance of those who fear Thy name." In Ps. 86:11 the Psalmist acknowledged that God is the one who can make a person fear His name. The Psalmist prays to this end, "Teach me Thy way, O LORD; I will walk in Thy truth; Unite my heart to fear Thy name."

These passages demonstrate that the Name functions once again as a surrogate for YHWH Himself.⁵⁶¹ Just as we have seen concerning loving the Name, fearing the Name means to fear YHWH, and in this case, additionally, His role as judge over all the earth.

CULTIC ACTS CARRIED OUT IN THE NAME

This category encompasses those acts of cultic devotion that are carried out in the Name, such as the raising of hands in worship (Ps. 63:5; *BHS* 63:4), or glorying or exalting *in* the Name (Ps. 105:3; I Chron. 16:10). Included in this group are commands to sing to the glory of the

⁵⁶⁰ Farby, "שֵׁם," 154.

⁵⁶¹ *Ibid.*

Name (Ps. Sol. 6:4). Not surprisingly, the use of the Name appears as an exchangeable concept for God Himself,⁵⁶² a pattern that I have often mentioned.

One passage of particular interest is Mal. 1:11, which, if taken literally states that the nations offered sacrifice to the Name. The passage is fraught with difficulty, textual and grammatical. Putting aside the textual questions which seem to plague the passage,⁵⁶³ the curiousness of the passage has led some to conjecture that the passage is a later interpolation. The question as to whether the passage serves as the conclusion of verses 6-10, or whether it serves as the changeover to verses 12-14, remains unclear-although some have suggested that verse eleven may consist of an ancient doxology which the author employed in his argument--thus offering a resolution of its awkwardness.⁵⁶⁴ Be this as it may, we are still left groping for an explanation of the passage itself. I will take up this issue now.

Essentially there are four interpretations that have been offered. The first interpretation maintains that the passage refers to the worship of YHWH by the Jews living in the Diaspora. The second proposes that the verse deals with worship offered by proselytes. The third major view maintains that the passage treats the future worship that will be offered to God by the nations.⁵⁶⁵ Lastly, the fourth position claims that the passage addresses the then present worship of God by the non-Jew. Although this question is of some interest, for the purposes of my work I need only address how the use of the God's name functions here. To determine this I must first entertain several factors.

First, it must be noted that the preceding verses (1:6-10) address the issue of YHWH's displeasure with inferior sacrifices, while the following verses (1:12-14) denounce those who offer these types of sacrifices. Second, the Name plays a thematic role in the text. For example, in the beginning, verse 1:6 speaks of the priests, who by their actions, are demonstrating that

⁵⁶² So Bietenhard, "ἄνομα," 260.

⁵⁶³ For a discussion of these issues see Th. C. Vriezen, "How to Understand Malachi 1:11," in *Grace upon Grace: Essays in Honor of Lester J. Kuyper*, ed. James I. Cook (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975), 129.

⁵⁶⁴ Vriezen, *ibid.*, 129.

⁵⁶⁵ I mention here the views of Rehm who argues that the universality of the offerings to the name of YHWH reflect the promised messianic age when the Gentiles will honor God: indeed, many patristic authors argue that the Church is the fulfillment of this passage. For more see Martin Von Rehm, "Das Opfer der Völker nach Mal. 1,11," in *Lux tua Veritas: Festschrift für Hubert Junker zu Vollendung des siebenzigsten Lebensjahres am 8 August 1961*, eds. Heinrich Gross and Franz Musser, (Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1961), 208.

they despise the name of God. Secondly, 1:11, after speaking about the sacrifice to the Name, the narrative tells of God's aim that His name should be honored among the nations. This theme is picked up again in 2:2, where the text speaks of the need to give glory to the name of God. In verse 3:16 it describes those who fear God as those "[who] fear the LORD and who esteem His name," while 4:2 promises to those who fear God's name that "the sun of righteousness will rise with healing in his wings." As Swetnam points out, the impure conduct of the Temple officials brought disrepute upon the Name which leads one to suppose that the text may be trying to add to the already noted contrast between pure and impure sacrifice by pointing out that pure sacrifices are directed here toward the Name, meaning that it is honored.⁵⁶⁶ This leads one to conclude that when the Name is honored, God is honored, and thus the Name functions here as a symbol for God.⁵⁶⁷

Another item worthy of note is that this passage is *sui generis* within the Old Testament; no other passage speaks of offering sacrifices to the Name. Also to be noted is that the incense might in fact be a symbol for prayer, just as is the case in Lk 1:10 and Acts 5:8.⁵⁶⁸

Whatever the case may be with respect to the outstanding issues over the text, or its origin, or even how one may collocate verse 11 with the other two complexes, it is sufficient for my purposes to observe how the passage functions within the larger context. In my judgment, the verse serves as the hinge about which the author intends to structure his argument. Given the bracketing passages, the argument may be constructed as follows: The priests have been offering inferior sacrifices (vv.6-10), sacrifices that are despicable in the eyes of YHWH. These sacrifices stand in stark contrast to those of the Gentiles who correctly offer up "pure sacrifices"(v. 11b). Thus, the argument runs along the same lines as that presented by Paul in his condemnation of the maternal incest taking place in Corinth among Christians. There, as here, the more circumspect practices of the Gentiles are cited with an eye toward highlighting the more

⁵⁶⁶ James Swetnam, "Malachi 1,11: An Interpretation," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 31 (1969): 202.

⁵⁶⁷ Swetnam offers the suggestion that the Name here represents God revealed and accordingly rejects that non-Jews are in view in this passage for only the Jews would the self-revelation of God through His name have meaning. See Swetnam, "Malachi 1,11: An Interpretation," 204.

⁵⁶⁸ Following the suggestion of Tidiman. See Brian Tidiman, *Les Livres d'Aggée et de Malachie* (VAUX-sur-SEINE: Éditions de la Faculté Libre de Théologie Évangélique, Edifac, 1993), 198.

offensive practices of the people of God.⁵⁶⁹ In any event, I have so far avoided addressing verse eleven. I shall turn to this verse now.

Given the fact that Israel's neighbors did offer cultus to the names of their deities can we then infer that in light of verse eleven that the author was endorsing a literal offering to God's name? Or are we rather to see in this passage that the Name is used as a symbol for God? Although the offering of cultus to the Name cannot be absolutely excluded in light of Gentile parallels⁵⁷⁰ in my estimation it strains credulity to accept without concrete evidence that Gentiles offered sacrifices to the name of the Jewish deity.⁵⁷¹ Consequently, I prefer to see here the employment of an authorial device intended to represent God by reference to His Name.

Finally, it is of tremendous import that the name of God represented God in *cultic* contexts such as that envisioned in Mal. 1:11. This cultic surrogacy is also witnessed in our other passages, viz. Ps. 63:5; and 105:3 (cf. *Ps Sol* 6:4). This fact highlights what we have learned earlier about a name being so closely interwoven with the bearer of the name that they could not be separated without great difficulty. Thus, the name of God could serve as a surrogate of sorts for God Himself in cultic acts.

SUMMARY

What can we glean from this survey? First, there is clear evidence of a line of progression through time of an ever-evolving and multivalent concept of the power and status of the Name.⁵⁷² Also, there is abundant evidence for the increasing use of the Name in magic. From the section on magic we can glean the following: 1) The name of God, and the names of angels and patriarchs, were believed by some to have a numinous and apotropaic quality;⁵⁷³ 2) the name

⁵⁶⁹ Vriezen, "How to Understand Malachi 1:11," 130.

⁵⁷⁰ It should be noted that Morton Smith accepts that YHWH was worshiped in various syncretistic cults. Smith draws upon Isa. 56:7, I Kings 8:41f, and Jonah 1:16 to support his views. Whether these passages mean that Yahweh's name was treated in a similar fashion as the names of pagan deities remains to be seen. In any event, see Morton Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 93f.

⁵⁷¹ So too Vriezen, "How to Understand Malachi 1:11," 130.

⁵⁷² Jacob has correctly identified this fundamental trend of post-Exilic Judaism. See *ING*, 18.

⁵⁷³ Here I must take issue with Giesebrecht's claim that the preposition *b^e* is never used instrumentally. On the whole this is correct, but I am rather wary of adopting this view with respect to the use of the Name in exorcisms and healings where the use can be construed to be instrumental in nature. For Giesebrecht's view see, *DATSGN*, 135.

God could be imparted to very select agents, usually one of his messengers (i.e., the Angel of the Lord); 3) the 'true' name of the divine being was the key to gaining control over it, at least in the mind of some; 4) bestowal by God of His name upon human agents transferred to the agent a unique *exousia* and commissioning; 5) the name of God in certain circumstance could convey His very essence and thus had numinous attributes.

Furthermore, the Name was one medium, if not the supreme medium, of God's revelation. It is, so to speak, as Grether states, "die dem Menschen zugewandte, die offenbarungsmäßige Seite Jahwes...so ist damit Jahve selbst als unnahbar angesehen. Nur in seinem schem kann der Mensch zu ihm kommen."⁵⁷⁴

As for the section on the phenomenological use of the Name it reveals the following: 1) the Name could, under proper circumstances, indicate that the one using the Name stood under the authority and commissioning of God. As such he was the representative of God;⁵⁷⁵ 2) the primary function of the Name in cultic settings was as a *symbolon* for God Himself. The fact that the Name could serve this function testifies to its preeminent role in representing God, as His surrogate, so to speak; 3) invoking the name of God was believed to draw God near and insure His presence. Others no doubt believed that the Name carried numinous and apotropaic power and could bring about healing and the warding off of evil spirits.

⁵⁷⁴ Grether, *NWGAT*, 40-41.

⁵⁷⁵ *Contra* Jacob who claims the phrase **בשם יהוה** never conveys the meaning of representation because no person or thing can by definition represent God. See, *ING*, 38.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE NAME OF JESUS IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY

An die Stelle des shem jahve tritt der Name Jesu als Inbegriff der Offenbarung...er wird...ausgerufen und durch ihn Kraftwirkungen vollbracht. Er wird also ganz ähnlich gebraucht wie der shem in der alttestamentlichen Früzeit.⁵⁷⁶

In these next two chapters I shall examine early Christian texts which either place the name of Jesus at the center of speculation and reflection, or where the name of Jesus is used by Christians in various functions, especially in ritual settings. In this present chapter my task is to seek to shed light on various passages which speak of the name of Jesus, or which speak about Jesus having received a divinely ordained name, and additionally to examine what these passages tell us about the early Christian cult and christological developments. In several cases, as we shall see, passages which involve speculation about the nature of the name of Jesus may have something to say about how early Christians used the name of Jesus in ritual settings. In the chapter to follow, I shall have one question in mind: how the name of Jesus was employed in early Christianity. I shall especially be focusing on the role which the name of Jesus played in cultic and ritual actions, and what these actions can tell us about the beliefs of the earliest Christians. We should be mindful, however, in our review of these materials that any analysis must be done with care, for the early Christian movement did not set about to leave us detailed accounts of their cultic behavior. We are left with only telltale clues that are found here and there in the primary sources. Still, careful examination of these sources promises to repay the attention devoted to them.

Another note of caution which should be sounded is that people in the modern era often see members of the Christian faith acting or speaking in the name of Jesus; in today's world such usage can be laid at the feet of tradition and rarely do modern Christians understand what this usage might have signified to the earliest Christians. We need, therefore, to throw away our modern perspective and try to recover the views of the earliest Christians. We must bear in mind that members of the new movement were made up of people who believed that invoking the name of God, or the gods, could actuate the power and authority of the divinity in a very literal sense. It is worth recalling that the new movement drew its members from a milieu which believed that one used only the name of the one true God, or in a Greco-Roman context, the

⁵⁷⁶ Grether, *NWGAT*, 183

name of the mightiest deity, in order to bring about the spiritual and supernatural changes which they sought.

In this present investigation I shall be looking to lay bare what the earliest Christians believed about the name of Jesus. Additionally, my investigation will seek to draw some conclusions about the nature of the Christian cult and the types of activities which were taken up in the pursuit of Christ-devotion in terms of how Christians employed the name of Jesus as suggested by these selected passages. I shall draw attention to how the use of name of Jesus informs us concerning the very earliest christological beliefs of the earliest Christians. All of the foregoing can be useful in helping to shape our understanding of the process of christological evolution.

As for the structure of this chapter I shall divide it into several sections. My investigation will begin with a review of New Testament passages which concern the claim that Jesus had received a divine name and/or that his name had some special significance. Included in this category will be those passages which claim that Jesus' name was indispensable in bringing about salvation. Essentially, I shall be conducting an 'exegetical tour,' as it were, of some of the most prominent passages which have the name-concept as an integral aspect of their christological claims. I shall entertain not only relevant New Testament texts, but also other early Christian texts which illuminate some particular aspect of my study. My primary focus shall be upon those texts where specific reflection over the name of Jesus is in some manner taken up.

Now, in terms of the following chapter, which deals with the use of the name of Jesus, I shall not delve into philosophical debates involving competing schools of thought about how one approaches, or interprets phenomenological activity. Instead, I intend to look at how Christians used the name of Jesus 'on the ground' so to speak. Beyond that I shall examine what the evidence can tell us about how the early Christian movement viewed Jesus, his place in the divine economy, and his relationship to God.

With the introduction firmly in hand I turn my attentions to those New Testament passages which speak of the name of Jesus in a christologically important fashion, or which speculate that Jesus had received a divine name from God. These passages are important, for they give us insight into the mindset of the early Christians concerning the role and status of the name of Jesus in the divine economy. These passages also demonstrate just how important a role the name of Jesus came to play in early Christianity. Passages which speak of the power of the

name of Jesus, or which detail how Jesus' name became the preeminent name (especially in light of the belief that God had elevated Jesus' name to the highest rank) are crucial in seeing how the earliest Christians justified their beliefs; indeed, they felt compelled to believe that the name of Jesus had been elevated above every other name at the command of God. Also, the passages which speak of Jesus receiving a divine name are instructive too, for they demonstrate that the earliest Christians were quite comfortable with name-speculation, and that the development of a Christian *Namenchristologie* came as easily as speculation over Jesus' role in the plan of God.

REFLECTION OVER THE PLACE AND FUNCTION OF THE NAME OF JESUS

1) Phil 2: 6-11

This passage is one of the most frequently discussed and controversial in all of the New Testament, with many issues seemingly resisting final elucidation. Furthermore, it can be said that it is difficult to overstate the importance of this hymn⁵⁷⁷ in enhancing our understanding of formative christological thinking and early Christianity. In many respects it forms the most crucial piece of evidence which we possess concerning the christological views of the earliest Christians, as well as providing vital information about the primitive Christian cult, insofar as this hymn was almost certainly recited in ritual contexts.⁵⁷⁸ It also provides crucial information on the means whereby the earliest Christians incorporated Jesus into the divine identity, all the while endeavoring to keep within the bounds which monotheistic scruples demanded.

In light of these considerations I shall be interested, therefore, to uncover both the meaning of the hymn, as well as its backdrop, but at the same time I shall leave untouched many of the other contested questions. For example, the original language of the hymn, or whether the hymn first existed in three stanzas, or two, or whether verses 8d and 11 were original to the hymn will be bypassed. Furthermore, etymological and semantic examinations of the meanings of the controversial *μορφῇ θεοῦ, ἄρπαγμὸν, ἡγήσατο, σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος* and so on are not germane to my study and will not be addressed. I shall assume for the purposes

⁵⁷⁷ I use the term 'hymn' here by established convention. I am aware that the entire question of the *Gattung* of this passage is controversial. Kennel, for example, has reopened this question once again and come to the conclusion that many so-called early Christian 'hymns' were not formed by adherence to an easily discerned fixed set of criteria. See Werner Kennel, *Frühchristliche Hymnen. Gattungskritische Studien zur Frage nach den Liedern der früh Christenheit*, WUNT 71, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

⁵⁷⁸ See Kramer, *Christos, Kurios, Gottessohn*, 61 and Klaus Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*, (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1967), 124.

of my study that the ‘hymn’ does in fact contain an incarnational grounding. In the end, my study will be primarily interested in three major areas.

Among my concerns is the fixing of the original *Sitz-im-Leben* which occasioned the composition of the hymn. Another area of interest is what the bestowal of the name/title signified for the early Christians. Finally, my last interest concerns what the hymn reveals to us about the nature of Christ-devotion, as well as how the name of Jesus functioned therein. At this point the least that can be said is that there are certain features of the hymn which suggest that any attempt to recover the original purpose of the hymn will prove most interesting, for the most striking feature of the hymn is that it contains a “dangerous binitarian view.”⁵⁷⁹ In order to unearth the original purpose of the hymn it will be necessary to cite the hymn in full. I shall cite the passage in Greek as there are too many aspects that need to be addressed with reference to the original language. The text reads:

- ⁶ Ὅς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων
οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο
τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ
⁷ ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν
μορφὴν δούλου λαβών
ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος
⁸ καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος
ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν
γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου
(θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ)
⁹ διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὑπερύψωσεν αὐτόν
καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ
τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα
¹⁰ ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ
Πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ
ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων
¹¹ καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσῃται
ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός
εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ Πατρὸς.⁵⁸⁰

⁵⁷⁹ In the words of Nagata. See Takeshi Nagata, *Philippians 2:5-11: A Case Study in the Contextual Shaping of Early Christianity*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary (Ann Arbor Mich.: UMI Dissertation Services, 1981), 288. I use the term binitarian to convey the sense of ‘two expressions’ of the divine reality; that is, Jesus and God.

⁵⁸⁰ The interested reader should review both Lohmeyer’s reconstruction, and Jeremias’ reconstruction which employs *parallelismus membrorum* as his guide. See Joachim Jeremias, “Zur Gedankenführung in den

It is obvious even at a first read that the cardinal point of the hymn is the enthronement of Jesus in ultimate authority where he receives universal acknowledgement, or possibly, according to some, worship.⁵⁸¹ The hymn sets out to lay down the reasons for the exaltation which it so powerfully depicts. Paul, however, utilizes the hymn to support an ethical point. He uses the hymn to admonish his readers to follow the same selfless, sacrificial path that their master had followed in his pre-temporal and earthly existence (2:6-8). Still, the hymn itself speaks of exaltation and universal acknowledgment and the rationale for it. This exaltation follows from Jesus' obedience to the will and plan of God, even to the point of accepting crucifixion. This obedience is underscored in the first part of the hymn (6-8), which relates the actions of the finite verbs and participles to the actions of Jesus. Thus, we see that Jesus, although existing in a divine form took on the form of a slave, and emptying himself, submitted to death upon the cross. The author's desire to stress that this abasement was volitional is reinforced by the use of reflexive pronouns in vv. 7 and 8. This first half is also distinguished from the latter half of the hymn for it employs 5 participial constructions that lend this section a certain conciseness. Also of interest is that we find no proper names in this section, nor any Old Testament allusions.

In contrast to the first half of the hymn, in the second half (vv. 9-11) it is God who is the subject of the main verbs, and it is Jesus who becomes the passive recipient of the divine action of exaltation. In contrast once again to the first half, this section now is full of proper names (e.g. ὁ θεός, Ἰησοῦς, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, and θεὸς πατρός), and the actions are now conveyed through finite verbs.

When we follow the flow of the hymn in its latter half we see that Jesus is exalted with the bestowal of the divine name being the very highest sign of this exaltation. We see this change of emphasis from the obedience of Jesus to God's exaltation of him in the phrase διό καί, which both signals the change of the subject of the action and emphasizes that the obedience referred to in verses 5-8 serves as the justification for his exaltation. Moreover, Διό, or as the case may be διὰ τοῦτο, is habitually used in contexts of humiliation and abasement with a subsequent

Paulinischen Briefen, Christushymnus Phil. 2:6-11," in *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii*, eds. J.N. Sevenster and WC van Unnik (Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953): 146-154.

⁵⁸¹ Bauckham sees this text as the earliest monument to the worship of Jesus, as do I. See Richard J. Bauckham, "The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11," in *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*, eds. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd., (Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 128.

exaltation and vindication.⁵⁸² The best translation of this would be “that is why”⁵⁸³ and serves to reinforce the belief that the first part of the hymn serves as the rationale for the vindication and exaltation which follow in the latter half of the hymn. In any case, the emphatic nature of this transition is further highlighted in the addition of *καί* to *διό*, which serves to strengthen the force of the particle.⁵⁸⁴ Further reinforcement is found in the position of *αὐτόν* which is emphatic and also serves to highlight God’s exaltation of Jesus. In addition, the reader should observe that the phrase “...every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord” stands as the apogee of a series of progressive phrases (e.g. 8-10) that speak of the exaltation of Jesus. Indeed, it carries the culmination of the progressive force of the verses 9-10.⁵⁸⁵

The degree of this exaltation is seen in the fact that the author adds *ὑπέρ* to *ὑψώω*, a compound term only used in the LXX, sans one exception (Ps. 36: 35), *for* YHWH.⁵⁸⁶ This would suggest that like YHWH, Jesus was raised above all creation;⁵⁸⁷ and in fact v. 10b reinforces this perception by adding several terms which denote that the entire cosmos (i.e. *ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων*) is subjected to Jesus. This contention is further strengthened by the claim that Jesus had received a name above (*ὑπέρ*) every name. This second use of *ὑπέρ* serves, when taken in tandem with the clause, *ὑπερύψωσεν αὐτόν*, to underscore that in the author’s thinking Jesus has been elevated above every conceivable being or power. It is also worth noting in this context that in keeping with this stress on exaltation, the word “*kyrios*” is granted special emphasis by being placed first in the phrase.⁵⁸⁸

⁵⁸² Joachim Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, (Freiberg: Herder, 1987), 125. Gnllka cites LXX Is. 53:12 and Wis. 4:14 among other texts.

⁵⁸³ Ralph P. Martin, *A Hymn of Christ. Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 1997), 231.

⁵⁸⁴ Ernst Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5-11*, (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaft. Phil.-hist. Kl., Jahr. 1927-28, 4. Abh.) (Heidelberg, 1928), 47.

⁵⁸⁵ Wengst rightly notes that the acclamation of Jesus is both the goal and the highpoint of the hymn. See Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*, 141.

⁵⁸⁶ Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief*, 125

⁵⁸⁷ Recent studies have tilted toward a superlative understanding of this verb rather than a comparative function. See Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*, 239-242.

⁵⁸⁸ Peter Thomas O’Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek text* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans’ Publishing Co., 1991), 246 and Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*, 271.

The extent of this exaltation is further seen in the bestowal of the divine name. The high honor of receiving the divine name is evident in the light of Isa. 42:8 (cf. Ps. 83:18), where God says of Himself, “I am the Lord (ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός), that is my name (τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ ὄνομα), that is mine and no one else’s.” If we cast about to seek a comparison for the extent of this exaltation we can only look to what the LXX says of God Himself in Ps. 96:9, “For Thou art the LORD Most High over all the earth; Thou art exalted far above all gods (ὑπερυψώθης ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς θεούς).” This text forms an admirable backdrop for understanding the exaltation that Jesus received. Finally, the universal acclamation (note that there is no qualifying “our” in the confession “Jesus Christ is Lord”) follows after the exaltation, and all of these actions take place according to the hymn for the glory of God the Father.⁵⁸⁹

If we retrace the hymn’s flow again we see that Jesus was originally existing in a divine state, subsequently consents to become human, obeys God, even to the point of death on the cross, and now at God’s initiative (ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ) he is exalted to Lord over all creation, authenticated, as it were, by the bestowal of the divine name, and acknowledged Lord by all creation. Most strikingly, this universal acknowledgement takes place ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ,⁵⁹⁰ and additionally, as Gnllka observes, “In der Akklamation wird der verliehene Name ausgesprochen und so anerkannt.”⁵⁹¹ There are, beyond what I have covered already, several other particulars worth mentioning.

First, with respect to the acclamation of Jesus we can discern that it bears many of the characteristics of an enthronement scene from antiquity, such as seen for example in Rev. 5: 1-14 (see especially v. 13) which carries many significant echoes of Phil. 2:9-10.⁵⁹² Indeed, the entire

⁵⁸⁹ Brown alertly notes that we might be witnessing an inchoate Son-of-God Christology here. He buttresses this possibility by positing that σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος might be the counterpart to the Synoptic εἰ υἱὸς εἰ τοῦ θεοῦ (Matt. 4:3, 6; Luke 4: 3, 9). See Colin Brown, “Ernst Lohmeyer’s *Kyrios Jesus*,” in *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*, eds. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd, (Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 16, 28.

⁵⁹⁰ So also Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief*, 127.

⁵⁹¹ Ibid., 129.

⁵⁹² Erik Peterson, *EIS ΘΕΟΣ. Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), 33-134, 171 fn. No. 3.

Deutero-Isaiah section from which the author draws for v. 9 (i.e., Isa. 45:23) depicts, and indeed assumes, an enthronement.⁵⁹³

Given the thrust of 2:9, where it states that Jesus receives the divine name, it is worth a quick reminder that one part of an enthronement was often the bestowal of a new name,⁵⁹⁴ a name befitting the new status and rank of the person. Käsemann clarifies the nature of the new exalted name when he states, “Der Name ist für die Antike ja nicht bloß Unterscheidungsmerkmal. Er bekundet vielmehr Würde und Wesen, strahlt gleichsam Wesenheit aus und macht sie manifest.”⁵⁹⁵ As Käsemann’s quote makes clear, in the logic of the ancient world a new position of higher rank was often seen as demanding a new name reflective of the new rank. I have already laid the groundwork for seeing in the hymn the claim that Jesus has been elevated to a place next to God. Nonetheless there are other compelling reasons to dig further, particularly with respect to the meaning of the title *kyrios*. Although I do not favor the notion that the Tetragrammaton was given to Jesus, a point that I shall take up shortly, it would prove fruitful to lay a foundation for the claim that the functional equivalent was given to Jesus.

In support of the view that the name given to Jesus is *kyrios* (=YHWH) there are several very illuminating texts which seem to offer compelling parallels to Phil. 2:9. For example, *Shi’ur Qoma* §692 states, “May his great, powerful and fearful Name be praised...which, [is] constant, and elevated above the heights.” Another relevant text is *Ma’ase Merkava* § 590, where we read, “Your name is holy in the highest heavens, high and exalted over all the Cherubim....”⁵⁹⁶ Nehemiah 9:5 speaks of the Name as “...exalted above all blessing and praise.” We also encounter this same view in Ps. 83:18, where we read, “Let them know that you alone, whose name is the LORD (יהוה) are the Most High over all the earth.” Moreover, in the LXX in Daniel 3:52 (Song of the Three Youths), we find the Name described as:

⁵⁹³ See Kraus Hans-Joachim, *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament: Untersuchungen zu den Liedern von Jahwes Thronbesteigung*, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1951), 107.

⁵⁹⁴ Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 22, cites several examples. Also Heitmüller, “Namenglauben im N.T.,” 663, and Jacob, *ING*, 51. Examples are found in the Old Testament (e.g. II Ki. 23:34) and in Persian enthronement ceremonies (e.g. Diodorus *Bibliothēkē* 15.93).

⁵⁹⁵ Ernst Käsemann, “Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2.5-11,” in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnung: erster Band* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 83.

⁵⁹⁶ Translation from Michael D. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: an analysis of Ma’aseh Merkavah*, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992): 246.

Εὐλογητὸς εἶ, κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ αἰνετὸς καὶ ὑπερυψούμενος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, καὶ εὐλογημένον τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης σου τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ὑπεραϊνετὸν καὶ ὑπερυψωμένον εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Another example is found in Midrash Ps. 9.6 where we read, “I want to praise your Name, You most High, your Name, which has been raised above every name.”⁵⁹⁷ We see from these examples that the name of God is said to be worthy of the highest praise and that it is elevated to the loftiest position. Hofius’ observation on this passage in connection to Phil. 2: 9 is also of some interest for he notes that for a covenant people the thought that any name other than the divine name (or its surrogate) is meant at Phil. 2:9, can, strictly speaking, be ruled out.⁵⁹⁸

We have further justification for inferring that the equivalent of the Tetragrammaton was given to Jesus when we turn to the observation of Lohmeyer, who has indicated that the name must be that of God for only God lives and exists above all and thus His Name must be in view here.⁵⁹⁹ He states in addition that “Es gibt nur einen „Namen über alle Namen“...Der Name trägt hier den gleichen Sinn wie etwa „das Wort oder „der Geist“...oder die „Schechina.”⁶⁰⁰ Heitmüller adds even more forcefully than Lohmeyer that “Bei dem τὸ ὄνομα ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα musste der jüdische Leser und Schreiber doch ohne weiteres an den altberühmten heiligen Namen mit seinen Wunderkräften denken.”⁶⁰¹

Another reference of note is found in Philo in his *De Abrahamo* 25.124, where he describes the three types of visions which belong to three distinct human states. Philo’s description of these states is as follows:

There are three different classes of human dispositions, each of which has received as its portion one of the aforesaid visions. The best of them has received that vision which is in the centre, the sight of the truly living God. The one which is next best has received that

⁵⁹⁷ As quoted in Hofius, *Der Christushymnus*, 109.

⁵⁹⁸ Hofius, *Der Christushymnus*, 39.

⁵⁹⁹ Lohmeyer, *KJ*, 53. So too Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 180.

⁶⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 54.

⁶⁰¹ Heitmüller, *INJ*, 237. It should also be mentioned that if Lohmeyer is correct about the three-stanza arrangement of the hymn than the third line of the last strophe, τὸ ὄνομα ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, corresponds to the third line of the first strophe, τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ. Here the name would be tied to equality with God. This connection would also hold for those reconstructions which fall back upon *parallelismus membrorum*. For example, following Hofius’ reconstruction, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, would correspond to οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ. The latter prospect of parallelism holds out greater promise for as Gnllka observes καὶ binds ἐκένωσε to ἐταπείνωσεν and this prohibits a three-membered hymn. For Hofius’ reconstruction see, *Der Christushymnus*, 8 and for Lohmeyer see, *KJ*, 51. As for Gnllka see, *Der Philipperbrief*, 121.

which is on the right hand, the sight of the beneficent power which has the name of God. And the third has the sight of that which is on the left hand, the governing power, which is called lord.

Here we find that what Jesus is said to have received in his exaltation, the Name and lordship, belongs only to the one who sits, or is at the very side of God.

I think that in the light of these examples that it is reasonably clear that it would have been quite impossible for ears trained to hear the words of Torah, such as the apostle Paul's would have been, to hear the teaching about the superiority of the name of God and to miscalculate somehow and think of another name apart from God's very own special name.⁶⁰²

Finally, it is of obvious import that the title *kyrios* in verse 11 is here used in light of the background of LXX Isa. 45:23. Given that this passage was coined to affirm that no other god exists except YHWH, we may then deduce that this establishes the pedigree of the name-it is none other the divine name-which Jesus now bears.

Although most commentators believe that the name bestowed upon Jesus is *kyrios*, several scholars believe that Jesus actually received the Tetragrammaton. Recently, Richard Bauckham has drawn attention to the fact that the hymn's portrayal of Jesus as partaking in the sovereign lordship of the created order must entail that Jesus be included "in the divine identity itself."⁶⁰³ For the Jews, one of God's most singular traits is His lordship over all things. Accordingly, when the hymn claims that Jesus is/will be acclaimed as the *kyrios*, Jesus must have been seen as sharing in God's divine prerogatives. Now if this inference is true then the name granted to Jesus *must* be God's own name, for no other name could possibly bear up under

⁶⁰² Wengst thought the transference of the divine name to be unthinkable and instead he endorsed the proposal of Bousset that *kyrios* was in mind and that this belief could be traced from the mystery cults. In marshalling support for his views he cites for his readers the example of Lucius, who calls Isis *κυρία*, in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 11.25. See *Christologische Formeln*, 127.

⁶⁰³ *Pace* Ruck-Schröder. Bauckham notes that the term *kyrios* is, strictly speaking, a substitute for the divine name and not in itself a name (cf. Justin' *Second Apol.* 6 which says as much) and that therefore the Tetragrammaton must be meant. I think that the notion that *kyrios* is only a title, and therefore not meant in Phil. 2:9, is erroneous. Several passages in the LXX, such as Isa. 42: 8 and Ex. 3:15 (e.g., ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός, τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ ὄνομα) expressly state that "Lord God" is also God's name. Moreover, Isa. 42:8 comes from the same section of Isaiah as 45:23; that is, the section which seeks to emphasize the claim that YHWH alone is God. Thus, the author of the hymn probably had this passage in mind when he composed the hymn. Accordingly, it is without foundation to say that the Tetragrammaton is in view. In any event, it is clear from the examples cited, that the title *kyrios* is the functional equivalent of the Tetragrammaton and bears the same weight. As Hofius put the matter "Der Ausdruck „der Name über alle Namen“ kann als eine Umschreibung des hochheiligen Gottesnamens, d.h. als eine mit „Kyrios“ gleichwertige Wiedergabe des Tetragramms verstanden werden." So, whether or not we choose to embrace Bauckham's proposal, the same result is reached making any argument come out to little more than a distinction without a difference. For further views on this from Hofius, see *Der Christushymnus*, 27. Also, see Bauckham, "The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11," 130-131, and Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 264.

the theological weight which the flow of thought in the hymn places upon the name.⁶⁰⁴ In fact, when one considers Bauckham's assessment of how the divine identity was reconfigured to include Jesus, it becomes obvious that Jesus, as part of the divine identity, would be counted as being worthy of bearing the divine name.⁶⁰⁵

Now that I have treated the bestowal of the divine name and its meaning I shall now turn my attention to unearthing the proper *Sitz-im-Leben* for the creation of the 'hymn.' As we shall see, unearthing the proper *Sitz-im-Leben* for the hymn will illuminate how the name bestowed upon Jesus was justified by the early Christians. To date, no single explanation has managed to persuade the scholarly world. This opens the door to other explanations than those already offered. In short, since all attempts to explain the background of the hymn have failed to convince, a new model is warranted, as we shall see.⁶⁰⁶

Any attempt to uncover the proper *Sitz-im-Leben* must take several peculiarities of the hymn into account. Regrettably, this has not been done except in two somewhat obscure attempts. If I may be allowed to hint at what the hymn's intent was, it can be summarized in the following fashion: the core of the Philippians hymn was *originally* (prior to becoming part of the hymn) a confession intended to justify newly emergent Christ-devotion. Several lines of evidence converge to underscore this possibility.

First, the hymn, especially the latter half, has a quite unmistakable polemical ring to it. As early as 1962 Braumann recognized this quality and correctly noted the following four form-

⁶⁰⁴ Ibid., 131. Parenthetically, although of late vintage I note that a similar notion is found in Memar Maqra at IV.1, where Moses' own name is made synonymous with that of God's, "Where is there a prophet like Moses, and who can compare with Moses, whose name was made the Name of his Lord." According to Macdonald this contention may have its origin in the fact that Moses' name משה, contains the same consonants as does the word 'name,' i.e. שמה. Thus this claim for the Name may reflect this consonantal overlap. In any event, Fossum has shown on independent exegetical grounds that the Tetragrammaton is in fact what is meant here. See Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 89-90. Also, III Enoch 12:15 recalls this same motif when it claims that Metatron, upon undergoing a similar elevation as envisioned by the Philippians hymn, receives the name "lesser YHWH." For particulars on matters relating to Memar Marqah see John Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans* (London: S.C.M., 1964), 184.

⁶⁰⁵ There is an evident tension in this hymn that is often overlooked. Although Jesus is given the divine name, it is nevertheless at the mention of *his* name that the universe bends the knee, rather than the divine name which Jesus possesses. It seems to me that this tension can be resolved only by recognizing that Jesus is now included in the divine identity, and as such, *his* name was worthy of the same acknowledgement ordinarily reserved for the name of God.

⁶⁰⁶ As for the other models which have been suggested they are reviewed, for the interested reader, in Appendix One. The shortcomings which are revealed there serve as justification for my attempt at uncovering the true background to the hymn.

critical considerations which indicated to him the polemical nature of the hymn: 1) Although the hymn is characterized by its brevity and the economy of its expressions the author nevertheless felt it necessary to pair a negative statement with a corresponding positive one even though they treat the same problem (e.g. ὁ ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων being the positive element, and οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, constituting the negative element in the case of 2:6; 2) By virtue of the fact that the positive statement is wholly sufficient to convey the meaning and intention of the author, it nevertheless occurs that the negative statement is expressly included; 3) The negative statement is constructed with the chief verb (ἡγήσατο in the case of 2: 6); 4) The negative statement is further emphasized through the first words (e.g., ἄρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο in the case of 2:6), which points to a certain condition which has decisive import for the first strophe.⁶⁰⁷

Braumann envisions the hymn as being composed in order to address “eine Situation, in die der Gegner das Gottgleichsein Jesu bestritten” and further states concerning the many claims of the hymn, “Wir haben möglicherweise in viel größerem Umfang die Sprache des Gegners vor uns...”⁶⁰⁸

Braumann’s thesis points us toward the correct *Sitz-im-Leben* and I would add that the use of Isa. 45:23, in a hymn with an astonishing redirection of universal acknowledgement toward Jesus and the climactic bestowal of the divine name, also points to a polemical situation.⁶⁰⁹ Insofar as I believe that the inclusion of Isa. 45:23 offers the solution to the puzzle it is time to ask just what particular situation might best explain the presence of the Isaiah passage and the granting of the Name.

⁶⁰⁷ Georg Braumann, *Vorpaulinische christliche Taufverkündigung bei Paulus*, (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1962), 57. At the time of Braumann’s work the prevailing consensus that the hymn was constructed using *parallelismus membrorum* had not yet taken hold. Braumann followed Lohmeyer’s three strophe reconstruction. Nonetheless, his points remain valid even under the new consensus.

⁶⁰⁸ Ibid., 60. Other than Nagata, whose work is reviewed below, Colin Brown forms one of the few modern commentators who sees the hymn in a manner that is at least somewhat consistent with Braumann’s observations. Brown states that in his view the hymn is “...a confession of faith in poetic form with its own hermeneutical commitments and interpretations which challenge those of the church’s adversaries.” He says further on that, “What we can say is that Phil. 2:6-11 forms a web of belief...including those of the adversaries of the church.” See Brown, “Ernst Lohmeyer’s *Kyrios Jesus*,” 24, 31.

⁶⁰⁹ Interestingly, Schenk is disposed to believe that the text is not reflective of a hymnic background but rather is reflective of a propaganda text that utilizes a basic form of antique rhetoric. See Wolfgang Schenk, “Die Philipperbrief in der neueren Forschung (1945-1985),” *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, Principat 25,4 (1987), 3300.

It is precisely in regard to this question that I believe that the work of Nagata has offered an interesting alternative to standard explanations of the background for the text. Nagata proposes that the hymn is a robust defense of the emergent Christ-cult. In Nagata's hypothesis the utilization of Isa. 45:23, and its reinterpretation in light of the Christ-event, signals that the early Christians were eliciting the support of the Old Testament for their worship which they direct toward Jesus. Moreover, the fact that Jesus receives the divine name itself is meant to signify that the redirection of cultus toward Jesus is not the invention of the community, but rather is completely justified because God has granted to Jesus the divine name in consequence of his obedience. Finally, the doxological conclusion, which maintains that all of the preceding exaltation of Jesus is done to the very glory of God himself, subordinates the new Christ-cult within the traditional boundaries of Jewish monotheism. As Nagata expresses it:

If the...discussed literary characteristics of the hymn are taken as a whole, it is clear that the hymn is concerned neither with the ethical exemplary value of the event of Christ, nor with eschatological and cosmic soteriological significance as such. The central concern of the hymn is the theological legitimization and affirmation of the christological claim that Jesus...is the cosmocrator...this identification does not violate the unity of God, but is grounded on God's own eschatological act and is, at the same time, scriptural.⁶¹⁰

In order to advance his conclusions Nagata has introduced a clever proposal.

Taking his cue from the work of Ségol, Nagata has suggested that the use of Isa. 45:23 is conditioned by a common Jewish hermeneutical twist where passages with either the unnatural repetition of the divine name, or where there are inconsistencies with respect to persons within a sentence (i.e. later third person usage in a sentence where the first person would be expected), allowed the reader to infer that two divine beings are spoken of in a particular text.⁶¹¹ Repetition of the name of God, divine mediator figures such as the Angel of the Lord, and unexpected pronoun changes, called for Jewish exegetes to explain these peculiar circumstances.⁶¹² The point here is that these sorts of passages served as the focal point for those who advocated a 'two

⁶¹⁰ Nagata, *Philippians 2:5-11*, 300. Cf. also pg. 315.

⁶¹¹ *Ibid.*, 331.

⁶¹² Besides the examples which I cited in my section on the Angel of the Lord tradition, I also note here Gen. 19:24, Ps. 110:1, and Isa. 45: 1, among other examples. One interesting rabbinic example comes from Rabbi Aqiba's interpretation of Daniel 7, which he maintained meant that a second throne had been set up for the Messiah. See *Sanhedrin* 38b.

powers' theology.⁶¹³ Most interestingly, this sort of exegesis is not restricted to the author of the hymn, for as Glasson has pointed out this same sort of 'plurality of divine persons' exegesis stands behind the Old Testament catena found at Heb. 1:6-12.⁶¹⁴ Indeed, it may have been a common device designed to 'find' allusions to Jesus in the Old Testament. Perhaps we might even speak of an early Christian hermeneutical convention.⁶¹⁵

Returning to Nagata, it is clear that he believes that a similar hermeneutical device stands behind the Philippians hymn. To follow Nagata's argument it will be necessary to cite first the LXX of Isa. 45:22-23. The LXX states:

ἐπιστράφητε πρὸς με καὶ σωθήσεσθε, οἱ ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς, ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος.²³ κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὁμνύω Ἡμῖν ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου

⁶¹³ For example, Philo treats several passages in an effort to remove their evident inconsistencies and preserve Jewish monotheism. See *De Somniis*, 1.227-229 and *Questiones et Solutiones in Genesim* II, 62. In the first case Philo sidesteps the problem of God's appearance to Laban with the accompanying statement, "I am the God who was seen by thee in the place of God," which naturally raised the prospect that there were two gods, by proposing that in the first instance the name of God is accompanied by the article while the second occurrence is anarthrous. Philo states that "What then ought we to say? There is one true God only; but they who are called Gods, by an abuse of language, are numerous; on which account the holy scripture on the present occasion indicates that it is the true God that is meant by the use of the article, the expression being, 'I am the God (*ho Theos*);' but when the word is used incorrectly, it is put without the article, the expression being, 'He who was seen by thee in the place,' not of the God (*tou Theou*), but simply 'of God (*Theou*).'" This fact, according to Philo, conveys that the anarthrous form signifies those secondary figures who are incorrectly conceived of as God. In contrast, the name with the article signifies the one true God. In the latter example of Gen. 9:6 Philo simply invokes the concept of the Logos as the explanation for the unnatural repetition. For further commentary see Alan Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 59-219, esp. pg. 164.

⁶¹⁴ Glasson notes at 1:6 that the author quotes from Deut. 32:43 in its Septuagintal form. The text reads: Καὶ προσκυνήσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (Let all the angels of God worship *him*). Also, Heb. 1:8-9 quotes from Ps. 45: 6-7, where it appears that two persons is indicated, "Your throne O God, is for ever and ever... Therefore God, *your God*, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above all fellows." In similar fashion Heb. 1:10-12 draws upon Ps. 102: 25-27. If we look at the passage it seems as though there could not possibly be a reference to Jesus. The text reads, "In the beginning you laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands. They will perish, but you remain; they will all wear out like a garment. Like clothing you will change them and they will be discarded. But you remain the same, and your years will never end." When we look a little closer at the Psalm we notice at vv. 20-22 the following statement, κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐπέβλεψεν... τοῦ ἀναγγεῖλαι ἐν Σιών τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου... This verse yields, as Glasson observes, the reading, 'The Lord looked upon the earth from heaven... to proclaim in Zion the name of *the Lord*.' For those who were drawn to this sort of 'plurality of divine persons' exegesis they would find reinforcement at v. 24, where the text reads, "*he* answered... *him*," (ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ἐν ὁδῷ ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ τὴν ὀλιγότητα τῶν ἡμερῶν μου ἀνάγγελόν μοι). Glasson further suggests that at some point vv. 23-24 was thought to be the words of the Son, while 25-28 involves the answer of the Father. Furthermore, at 1:13, the author cites the well known passage in Ps. 110:1 where the Psalm begins, "The Lord said to my Lord." Although Glasson pulls up shy in pushing this Psalm it is evident that it too fits the pattern of the other Psalms where two persons could plausibly be understood as being referred to. For further details see T. F. Glasson, "'Plurality of Divine Persons' and the Quotations in Hebrews I. 6 ff.," *NTS* 12 (1966): 270-272.

⁶¹⁵ This convention no doubt derives from prior Jewish practice. Segal has shown just how indebted contemporaneous Jewish hermeneutical practice was to this sort of 'plurality of divine persons' exegesis. See Alan Segal, *Two Powers*, 161-172, which deals with the example of Philo's use of this kind of exegesis.

δικαιοσύνη, οἱ λόγοι μου οὐκ ἀποστραφήσονται ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα τῷ θεῷ ²⁴ λέγων Δικαιοσύνη καὶ δόξα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡξουσιν, καὶ αἰσχυνθήσονται πάντες οἱ ἀφορίζοντες ἑαυτούς,...

Drawing attention to v. 23 Nagata has astutely noted that an inconsistency exists between the use of the first person pronoun ἐμοί and the regular dative prepositional construction of τῷ θεῷ, which, functionally speaking is in the third person. This would allow for the prospect of distinguishing between the speaker, designated by κύριος in v. 18, and ἐμοί in v.23, from the figure designated by θεῷ in v.23.⁶¹⁶ The sense of the passage would then be “Every knee will bow *to me* and every tongue confess *to God*...”

Following this logic we find that the passage allows for the possibility of seeing here a reference to two figures on the part of the first Christians. This proposed distinction allows Nagata to envision that Phil 5: 9-11 is a midrashic rendering of Isa. 45:23, and as such the concluding doxology in Phil 2: 11, εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός, is an expansion of τῷ θεῷ in Isa. 45:23, while the first-person pronoun ἐμοί which Nagata proposes implies a second figure, is replaced by ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ.⁶¹⁷

Nagata’s proposal has the added value in that it explains several curiosities of the hymn, viz. the fact that the community is nowhere mentioned, and the absence of any summons to praise either on the part of the community or the individual.⁶¹⁸ This unexpected absence of reference to the community or to their praise and worship creates the impression that the hymn’s *Sitz-im-Leben* is not to be found in the worship of the community, even though it almost certainly came to play a central and indispensable role in the cult. Instead, the hymn bears every sign that it was (or its core confession which had Isa. 45:23 as its backbone) originally a solemn confession, perhaps said at baptism, or in other cultic settings. Now if Nagata’s proposal is correct then the form of the justification for their binitarian pattern of devotion could hardly appear as anything other than a confession (although a confession can also be used in the sense of praise).

⁶¹⁶ Nagata, *Philippians*, 283.

⁶¹⁷ O’Brien has correctly noted the exchange of phrases but fails to recognize its import to Nagata’s thesis. See *Epistle to the Philippians*, 243.

⁶¹⁸ Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus*, 119. It should be noted that in contrast to Rev. 5: 11-14, we do not see any reference to expressions of praise. Still, the setting could reflect praise in its present form, although presumably the core confession; that is, Isa. 45:23, never had this in mind.

Pushing further we observe that another peculiarity of the hymn is its change of tense from the future tense of Isaiah to the aorist subjunctive.⁶¹⁹ It is a curiosity which demands some investigation. First, we need to bear in mind that the change of tenses was obviously done to fulfill a need by the author or community to which the hymn was addressed. It would appear that this need was obviously to bring the future claims of the passage to bear upon the community's present situation. In other words, some specific event(s) occasioned this change in verb tense. Are there then any clues left which might point the way to a solution? There is one and it that the change from a future verb clearly points out that the hymn *is not eschatological in its orientation, but is instead christologically oriented*.⁶²⁰

Now if we ask just what concrete historical situation occasioned this remarkable reading of Nagata's, I introduce the possibility that the opponents of the emergent Christ-cult had thrown Isa. 45:23, with its strident affirmation of monotheism, into the teeth of the early Christians. Indeed, as Segal has observed, the very Deutero-Isaiah passage from which the author of the hymn draws for his claims in verse 9 are in fact the very texts upon which the Tannaitic rabbis, and no doubt many scribes in the first century C.E. relied on to defend Jewish monotheism.⁶²¹ Isaiah 45:23 also came to play an important role in later Jewish liturgy precisely because this passage contains the most vigorous statement of monotheism in the whole of the Old Testament.⁶²²

⁶¹⁹ Regarding the tenses Martin notes that although the textual evidence is finely balanced with respect to the aorist and future forms of ἐξομολογεῖσθαι the future form is the *lectio difficilior* for the aorist form which is readily explained as an attempt to bring conformity in the aorist tense of κάμψῃ. Whatever the true state of affairs might be, Martin draws attention to the fact that during the post-classical period η and ε were used interchangeably. Therefore no fixed selection of one of the two forms of ἐξομολογεῖσθαι needs to be made. See Ralph P. Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*, 266.

⁶²⁰ Ibid. As correctly observed by O'Brien. This is not to say that the author did not envision the future submission of the universe to the victorious Christ, but only that this future submission is made to serve present realities.

⁶²¹ See Segal, *Two Powers*, 33f., 57.

⁶²² See for example the "Nišmat Kol-hay" hymn,
 Every mouth shall praise you
 every tongue swear to you
 every knee shall bow before you
 every form shall cast themselves down before you
 and every one shall praise your Name inside
 you God in the omnipotence of your power
 you Great one in the glory of your Name...

Just how vigorous a defense of monotheism this was can be seen in the fact that in its original context Isaiah 45: 23-25 is part of the so-called trial speeches. This section opens with the summons to a trial (v. 20, “declare and present your case; let them take counsel together”), which is meant to depict a courtroom with YHWH as the final arbitrator as to the validity of the case. In all of the trial speeches the concern of the author was to refute the claims of the gods of the nations and to establish the sovereignty of YHWH. This was accomplished by emphasizing the role of YHWH as creator, savior, and redeemer. What these speeches hoped to demonstrate was that YHWH alone is God and indeed this very verdict is pronounced in verse 21. In fact it is YHWH Himself who declares His sole claim to be God. We need to keep this background in mind when we turn to the question of what the early Christians may have had in mind when they penned this hymn.

First, I propose that the opponents of Christ-devotion drew upon Isa. 45:23 as a proof text designed to defend Jewish monotheistic scruples, and subsequently this passage formed the basis for their accusations against the newly emergent Christ-cult.⁶²³ This was followed by a counter reaction by the early Christians, who were forced to scrutinize carefully the passage, and subsequently, they uncovered the incongruity between the first person ἐμοί and the functionally third person τῷ Θεῷ. This discovery was then used to fashion the hymn in order to buttress the claims of the early Church that directing obeisance to Jesus was both in keeping with God’s will, and well within Jewish monotheistic scruples. This latter aspect goes far in explaining the closing clause, εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρός, which looks back to the earlier clause διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεός and is designed to emphasize that it was God who had exalted Jesus.⁶²⁴ This proposal also helps to explain why the allusion to Isa. 45:23 does not adopt the future tense of the original citation.

And the third prayer of the Qiddish is also relevant, “...how we know YHWH our God, that the Lordship is with you...and your Name is raised over all, what you have created.” For more discussion of these texts see Hofius, *Christushymnus*, 48-51.

⁶²³ I am indebted to Prof. L. Hurtado who first proposed this hypothesis to me. Gniska adopts a different take on Isa. 45:23 and instead sees here an emphasis upon judgment which extends even to the cosmic powers. See *Der Philipperbrief*, 128.

⁶²⁴ As Hofius states, “Alle Aussagen der zweiten Hymnusstrophe stehen ja in einer Klammer, die durch das einleitende διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεός V. 9a und durch die Schlussklausel εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρός V. 11c markiert wird. Das heisst: Gott, der Vater, ist das handelnde Subjekt im Geschehen der einzigartigen Erhöhung Jesu Christi, und zu seiner Verherrlichung geschieht sowohl diese Erhöhung selbst wie auch das weltweite Echo, das sie in der Anrufung Jesu als des Kurios findet.” See Hofius, *Der Christushymnus*, 112.

It is time now to address several other questions. The first involves what this passage tells us about the earliest Christian cult. Strong clues are found in the statement that “in the name of Jesus every knee will bow and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord.” We have already seen that the hymn claims that the entire cosmos will bow the knee and confess that Jesus is Lord. Here we see indications of the sort of ritual actions that no doubt served as a *Vorbild* for the Christian cult. Deichgräber has rightly stressed that the terms *exhomologeîn* and *onoma* are signposts that this confession found its rightful place in the cult.⁶²⁵ His own supposition was that it might have been a sort of Psalm that was sung in the cult.⁶²⁶ Another possibility is that originally the confession found a place in the baptismal rite. What speaks in favor for this setting is the fact that during baptism the baptizand confessed that Jesus is the Lord, as well as the conclusion that baptism took place under invocation of the name of Jesus.

Sadly, there are too many gaps in our knowledge, so that we may never know exactly where in the cult, or in which ritual action, this confessional piece had its place. But what does stand out is that the evidence suggests that the early Church saw here the very ideal for confession/praise within cultic settings. Most importantly, it is clear that the name which stood at the very heart of the cultus was (Lord) Jesus (Christ). As Lohmeyer states, “Denn das Entscheidende ist, daß diese geschichtliche Gestalt Jesu ist,...die die vierte Strophe schilderte, ist „dieser Jesus“ Herr, und sein geschichtlicher Name kann gleichen Sinnes und Rechtes mit dem erhabenen Namen Gottes gesetzt werden...”⁶²⁷ Indeed, the establishment of this equal footing rests upon God’s “clothing” the name of Jesus with His own and through bestowal of His name Jesus received the power and authority of God.

When we turn to taking up the question of the time period when this possible Christ-devotion was begun, it would seem that the very antagonism of the Jewish opponents suggests that the Christ-cult was already in full bloom prior to the composition of the hymn. This is an important observation, for as Kramer correctly points, out the acclamation itself must obviously

⁶²⁵ Deichgräber, *Gottes hymnus und Christushymnus*, 132.

⁶²⁶ Ibid.

⁶²⁷ *KJ*, 58.

predate the hymn.⁶²⁸ If the hymn actually does go back to the pre-Pauline era, as is commonly supposed, then the acclamational confession must go back to the very earliest strata of Christian tradition.

Furthermore, the bowing of the knee and confessing with the mouth takes on the same shading as Rev. 5: 11-14, which portrays the heavenly worship of Jesus for those who accept him. Some scholars think this suggests that the hymn depicts a universal and heavenly worship⁶²⁹ as well as acknowledgement of the Lordship of Christ.⁶³⁰ Other scholars think though that in spite of this the hymn means that the cosmos must bow under compulsion and openly confess that Jesus is Lord.⁶³¹ Whatever the real state of affairs, it is clear that every ritual act takes place under the naming of the name of Jesus.

One last consideration remains: what prompts the action of bowing the knee and confessing?⁶³² To answer this we need to observe that vv. 10 and 11 have a chiasmic *abba* structure which pairs **Κυριος** with **ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι**.⁶³³ Secondly, the use of Isa. 45:23 suggests the possibility that **ἐν** might be instrumental and this would fit nicely with the ‘compulsory’ sense of Isa. 45: 24, which states that *all* who have “ragged against him will come to him and be put to shame.” Does this suggest that the power of the name of Jesus will cause all unwilling participants to bend the knee? This is a difficult question to answer; it may only mean that the calling out of the name of Jesus provides the cue for the participants to bend the knee and confess. Still, given the context of Isa. 45:23-24, with its implied compulsion by force (i.e., the

⁶²⁸ Ibid., 64. Deichgräber thinks that it might be the oldest confessional piece in early Christianity. See *Gottes hymnus und Christushymnus*, 118.

⁶²⁹ O’Brien notes that in the LXX **ἐξομολογήσεται** took on the meaning of worship and confession of praise to God when used to render *yādā*. See *Epistle to the Philippians*, 240, 246.

⁶³⁰ Indeed, v. 11 makes clear the action is done for the glory of God and this implies that the confession (or worship) was directed toward Jesus.

⁶³¹ O’Brien prefers to see, as do I, the use of the **ἐξομολογήσεται** as being more related to open confession than worship in Isa. 45:23, and by extension it might be argued that confession is more suitable to the Philippians hymn. See *Epistle to the Philippians*, 248.

⁶³² Or as the case may be, worship. Lohfink correctly remarks that this must be directed to Jesus according to the hymn (as it is in Heb. 1: 6 and Rev. 5:8, 14), and not God, as many exegetes would have it. See Gerhard Lohfink, “Gab es im Gottesdienst der neutestamentlichen Gemeinden eine Anbetung Christi,” *Biblische Zeitschrift* 18.2 (1974): 169.

⁶³³ O’Brien, *Epistle to the Philippians*, 247.

claim that *every* knee will bow and *every* tongue confess), it is likely that the ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι phrase is instrumental in meaning.

2) EPHESIANS 1:18-22

For the purposes of my study verses 21-22 are of particular importance. This passage will show just how powerful the name of Jesus was believed to be in relation to the spiritual powers of the cosmos. In the context, the author use verses 20-22 to establish just how exalted and mighty Jesus presently is, and this helps to underscore the blessings and benefits found in verses 18-19. To begin, I shall cite the text in full in order to see the larger context:

I pray that the eyes of your heart may be enlightened, so that you may know what is the hope of His calling, what are the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints, 19 and what is the surpassing greatness of His power toward us who believe. These are in accordance with the working of the strength of His might 20 which He brought about in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and seated Him at His right hand in the heavenly places, 21 far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in the one to come. 22 And He put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Him as head over all things to the church.

Superficially read it would seem that this passage has nothing to do with the name of Jesus. The passage says only that Jesus is exalted above all conceivable powers that can be named. But if Jesus is elevated above every 'name being named' does this not mean that Jesus' name is greater than all other names? This must be true when we recall that in the ancient world a person or thing is tied to their name; indeed, it summarizes their nature and position. Accordingly, when the author states that Jesus is elevated above all names being named this can be reformulated to read: "Jesus' name is above every name being named." Just how momentous this claim is will be seen momentarily.

Now one notices straightaway that this passage carries many formal similarities to passages such as Col. 1:16, I Peter 3:22, I Cor. 15:24 and Rom. 8:38, in that the reference to ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, κυριότης, and δύναμις serves a similar function in these passages in designating those powers who were subjected to Jesus after his exaltation.⁶³⁴ The passage also quickly reminds one of Philippians 2:5-11 in that both deal with the enthronement of Jesus above

⁶³⁴ An almost similar listing is found in the *Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch* 20:1 (see also fn 641), where the heavenly powers which Enoch sees are described as δυνάμεις, κυριότητες, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, and θρόνοι.

every other power. A further similarity is found in the fact that it is God who bestows this elevated position on Jesus.⁶³⁵

In order to come to grips with the meaning of this passage, it is necessary to get a handle on the powers that are named in v. 20. We find our most positive indication further on at 6: 12, where the author describes these powers as those which are not "...flesh and blood, but principalities and powers," who are, "the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realm" (cf. I Cor. 15: 24-26). The perception that we are dealing with hostile spiritual forces in 1:20 is reinforced further when 2: 2 is taken into account. Here the author speaks of the enemy of Christians as the "ruler of the kingdom of the air." A further clue is unearthed by consultation of the *PGM*, where at I.215 and IV.1193, we find recorded that the word ἐξουσία could be used to signify evil powers.⁶³⁶ Now with respect to the term δύναμις the LXX often employs δυνάμεις to refer to the angelic 'hosts of heaven,' but this interpretation might be too narrow for this passage.⁶³⁷ Our last term κυριότης is, as Arnold indicates, to be taken in coordination with the other terms and signifies a special class of angels.⁶³⁸ And insofar as the author alludes to Ps. 110:1 in v. 20 this necessitates that these powers include hostile powers.⁶³⁹

As we look closer at this passage the phrase, παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου, it is obvious that there is more to this phrase than first meets the eye. This phrase carries a significant connotational thrust in the direction of both exorcism and magical incantations.⁶⁴⁰ This observation helps to reinforce our conclusion that the previously mentioned terms (i.e., πάσης

⁶³⁵ Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 99.

⁶³⁶ As noted in Clinton Arnold, *Ephesians: Power and Magic. The Concept of Power in Ephesians in light of its historical setting*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 53.

⁶³⁷ E.g., II Kings 17:16; 21:3, 5; 23:4f.

⁶³⁸ Arnold, *Ephesians: Power and Magic*, 54.

⁶³⁹ Ibid., 56. Schnackenberg also understands these terms as relating to cosmic powers of darkness, as does A. Lincoln. See Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament Band 10, ed. Josef Blank, (Zürich: Einsieden; Köln: Benziger Verlag and Neukirchen-Vlurn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), 76-77 and Andrew Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 63.

⁶⁴⁰ Ibid., 54.

ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος) connote spiritual powers,⁶⁴¹ and a review of the *PGM* shows that the use of ὄνομα instead of a specific name by the exorcist or theurgist, can in certain cases, be used in a comprehensive sense to denote all conceivable forces and powers.⁶⁴² Indeed, over a century ago Conybeare expressed his conviction that this particular expression has as its most comfortable fit a milieu where exorcisms of the type that we have already seen from the *PGM* were common.⁶⁴³ It is therefore of more than passing interest that Asia Minor, and Ephesus in particular, is portrayed in Acts (19: 11-20) as a center for mavens of Hellenistic magic.⁶⁴⁴ And it may be of some import to note, as Arnold has done,⁶⁴⁵ that the only place in either the Pauline *Hauptbriefe* or the Deutero-Pauline letters which employs the verb ὀνομάζω (three occurrences) are all found in Eph (e.g. 1:21; 3:15; 5:3), and that within all of the New Testament is it utilized elsewhere only by the Jewish exorcists spoken of in Acts 19:13.

Beyond these considerations we should note that the word itself, ὀνομαζόμενον, means in the context that the powers in question were known and named by mankind.⁶⁴⁶ Thus, the phrase ‘the name above every name that is named’ is meant to convey that Jesus’ name is greater than every name that is invoked by men as either gods, angels, or demons. In essence the passage implies that the name which Jesus possesses is above every other name and this in turn suggests that Jesus’ position as the **Κυρίος** is in view. In fact, the author has already engaged this theme in Eph. 1:10, where he writes that the goal of God’s work is to bring all things in heaven and earth under Christ, and this signifies God’s rule (cf. 4:5-6). Little wonder then that if one looks at the flow of thought from v. 20f it is God who raised Jesus from the dead; and it is God who

⁶⁴¹ Ibid. In an oft-quoted portion of the *Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch* (20:1) concerning the meaning of the terms we have encountered above I note the following expression, “And I saw...the incorporeal forces (δυνάμεις; cf. *I Enoch* 61:10, and *I Pet.* 3:22) and the dominions (κυριότητες) and the rulers (ἀρχαί; cf. *Rom.* 8:38), and the authorities (ἐξουσίαι; cf. *Test. Levi* 3:8)...”

⁶⁴² Arnold, *Ephesians: Power and Magic*, 55.

⁶⁴³ Ibid., 55. I am indebted here for Arnold’s indication of Conybeare’s opinion on this expression.

⁶⁴⁴ No doubt this attraction was facilitated by the fame of the so-called *Ephesia Grammata*. With the possible exception of Thessaly and Egypt I know of no other such magnet for drawing those who dabbled in magical practices.

⁶⁴⁵ Arnold, *Ephesians: Power and Magic*, 55.

⁶⁴⁶ Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 98.

question, it is God who subjects all things under Jesus and installs him as head of the Church (1:22).

In connection with this elevation it is important to bear in mind that being at the right hand of God is not only a place of honor but of power as well (cf. Ex. 15:6; Ps. 89:13; Isa. 48:13). In addition, the author further stresses this elevation when he places Jesus in the heavenly realm (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις). This spatial placement is obviously designed to express the belief of the superiority of Jesus over all spirits. Furthermore, the author expresses the fact that every conceivable power had been subjected to Christ in his use of, πᾶς ὄνομα ὀνομαζόμενος, which is an unambiguous statement that Christ now rules over every conceivable power. It is now time to look at what this passage suggests concerning the use of the name of Jesus in ritual settings.

The passage makes clear that Jesus' name is above all other names; that is, it is more powerful (and consequently bears the greatest authority), than any other name. This of course suggests that the readers employed solely the name of Jesus in ritual settings. We have already seen that Greco-Roman religious adherents naturally invoked the name of the most powerful deity. To do anything else was a waste of time. No less can be expected here. Given the pre-eminent place which the name of Jesus occupied, a fact the Apostles stressed time and again, it seems clear the Jesus' name was employed, both to initiate, as well as to authorize cultic activities in the early Church.

3) Mt. 1:18-25

In the beginning of the Gospel of Matthew we find a remarkable narrative in which the author devotes considerable theological reflection and imagination to the meaning and bestowal of the name 'Jesus.' The text reads (1:18-23):

Now the birth of Jesus Christ was as follows. When His mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child by the Holy Spirit. 19 And Joseph her husband, being a righteous man, and not wanting to disgrace her, desired to put her away secretly. 20 But when he had considered this, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, "Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary as your wife; for that which has been conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit. 21 "And she will bear a Son; and you shall call His name Jesus, for it is He who will save His people from their sins." 22 Now all this took place that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled, saying, 23 "Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bear a Son, and they shall call His name Immanuel," which translated means, "God with us."

At first glance what stands out is the surprising claim that Jesus will be called by two names, viz. the proper name Jesus and the symbolic name Immanuel. The latter name is derived from Isa. 7:14, where God had told King Ahaz that he can ask for a sign as an assurance that Isaiah's original council was to be trusted. This sign was thought necessary because the king was subjected to a threat from the Syro-Ephraimite war of 734 B.C.E. and he was in need of assurance that his kingdom would not fall to his enemies as Isaiah had proclaimed. In the narrative, Isaiah responds that God Himself will give a sign. The text reads, "Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Look, the young woman is with child and shall bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel (Ἐμμανουήλ)."⁶⁴⁷ This sign was meant to assure Ahaz that God was with him and Judah in this trying time.

Now without doubt this inclusion is a Matthean contrivance, for it is wholly without precedence in other New Testament texts. If nothing else, Matthew's unique adoption of this passage serves to remind us of the importance which he placed on demonstrating that Jesus' birth was supernatural. In point of fact, the Isaiah passage was included in order to serve the purpose of showing that the supernatural birth of Jesus through the Spirit of God was in fulfillment of the Scriptures.⁶⁴⁸ It also served the purpose of demonstrating that Jesus received his name through the Spirit of God. This aspect is further reinforced by the claim that it was the Angel of the Lord (v.20) who proclaimed Jesus' name to Joseph. This angelic pronouncement is in keeping with the tradition whereby angels announce miraculous births (or the names of sons; cf. Gen. 16:11, 17:19; Isa. 7:14; I Kgs. 13:2; Lk. 1:13,31).⁶⁴⁹ The author strengthens this perception further by also utilizing a prophetic motif by which the future greatness of significant persons was often announced.⁶⁵⁰

In addition, the author's adoption of Isa. 7:14 also signals that he is concerned to demonstrate that in Jesus God was visiting His people, and like Ahaz, He would remain with them through their turbulent and sometimes perilous embrace of Christianity. Briefly stated, the

⁶⁴⁷ Quoted from the New Revised Standard Version.

⁶⁴⁸ W.D. Davies, and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew V. Number I*, (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1988), 212.

⁶⁴⁹ Ibid., 207.

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid., 209.

bestowal of the name Immanuel conforms to the same pattern as that found in Isaiah 7:14; that is, a pattern of deliverance and divine presence. This is seen in the fact that Matthew connects the one name, Immanuel, which demonstrates divine presence, with Jesus, a name meant to establish a link with divine deliverance. No doubt a further concern of the author was to bind the advent of Jesus to the promised presence of God in these latter (messianic) days.

A further link that the author thinks worthwhile to establish is Jesus' Davidic credentials, which he demonstrates by showing that he stands in the proper genealogical line of the House of David. He shows this concern in the fact that it is Joseph who receives the angel's proclamation, addressed by the angel as υἱὸς Δαβίδ. The establishment of proper Davidic lineage creates the first basis for legitimating Jesus' messianic position, as well as his installation as King of the Jews.⁶⁵¹

The next aspect which demands our attention is the explanation of the etymology of the name of Jesus in light of the angelic explanation that his name was chosen, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. This interpretation draws not from the Greek Ἰησοῦς, but rather from the Hebrew יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, an abbreviation of יְהוֹשֻׁעַ.⁶⁵² The name combines two terms and means 'YHWH saves.'⁶⁵³ In spite of the fact that the name means 'YHWH saves,' the author makes clear that it is Jesus who will save the people from their sins (v. 20). In the realm of salvation this claim in essence places Jesus on a plane with God, functionally speaking.⁶⁵⁴ In any event, Matthew is following here the common Semitic conception that a name represents a person as I Sam. 25:25 illustrates concerning Nabal, "Please do not let my lord pay attention to this worthless man, Nabal, for as his name is, so is he. Nabal is his name and

⁶⁵¹ At 2:2, for example, the Magi can ask about the location of the 'King of the Jews', while Herod in 2:4 asks about the whereabouts of 'the Christ.'

⁶⁵² And it is worth noting that Jesus' Hebrew name must have contained the shortened form of the Tetragrammaton, a fact that I shall return to in my section concerning the *nomina sacra*. See Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 123 fn. 9.

⁶⁵³ See also Ruck-Schröder *DNGJNT*, 123. Interestingly, Philo states in *Mut Nom* 121 that Jesus (i.e. Joshua) means σωτηρία κυρίου. In contrast to Matthew, Luke is interested only in the fact that Jesus' name is bestowed by an angel, even though he surely must have understood what the name meant. This accent on the angelic bestowal signifies, as Legrand noted, "que le nom a une origine céleste, et donc une puissance surnaturelle." See L. Legrand, "On l'appela du Nom de Jésus (Luc II, 21)," *Revue Biblique* 89 (1982): 486.

⁶⁵⁴ Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 124. Here I mean in the sense that God had installed Jesus in the position whereby he could forgive sins.

folly is with him...” Accordingly, the author is taking pains to emphasize that Jesus *is* salvation; simply put, Jesus saves (cf. 8:25; 9: 21-22; 14:30; 27:42). I shall have more to say about this in my concluding section. For now, it is worth keeping this conclusion in mind.

With respect to “Immanuel”, we find that the author’s emphasis on this name lies in the fact that he provides what the LXX does not; a translation of the Hebrew name which he renders as μεθερμηνευόμενον μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός.⁶⁵⁵ This rendering makes evident that the author sees Jesus as the personal embodiment of the presence of God with man.⁶⁵⁶ The fact that the author has taken the trouble to offer a translation reinforces the perception that he placed great weight upon alerting his readers that Jesus *personally* embodies the very presence of God with His people. The author’s evident care in producing this section, and the emphasis on the name(s) of Jesus, serves in establishing the christological claims which can be followed throughout the rest of the Gospel. As such, the whole of the rest of the Gospel can be read with reference to the dual naming of Jesus.

4) Mt. 18:15-20

This passage has engendered a great deal of attention for its evident allusion to Jewish speculation over the *Shekhina*. To show this I begin by citing the text:

And if your brother sins, go and reprove him in private; if he listens to you, you have won your brother. 16 But if he does not listen *to you*, take one or two more with you, so that by the mouth of two or three witnesses every fact may be confirmed. 17 And if he refuses to listen to them, tell it to the church; and if he refuses to listen even to the church, let him be to you as a Gentile and a tax-gatherer. 18 Truly I say to you, whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. 19 Again I say to you, that if two of you agree on earth about anything that they may ask, it shall be done for them by My Father who is in heaven. 20 For where two or three have gathered together in My name, there I am in their midst.

A few observations are in order. First, this logion belongs to the Matthean *Sondergut*. Within the Matthean *Sondergut* the use of the expression εἰς τὸ ἑμὸν ὄνομα is *sui generis* (sans 28:19). Certain features of the saying lend credence to the perspective that the logion may possibly have its origin in traditional materials that the evangelist has taken up and incorporated into his Gospel. Brooks concisely summarizes the evidence for such a supposition:

⁶⁵⁵ μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός comes from LXX Isa. 8:8.

⁶⁵⁶ Correctly Ruck-Schröder. See *DNGJNT*, 126.

The vocabulary in v. 19 is not characteristic of Matthew. *Symphôneô*, 'to agree', occurs only here and in an unparalleled parable in 20.2, 13 in Matthew. *Pragmatos*, 'matter', is a *hapax legomenon* in Matthew...The use of *synagô*, 'gather together', for Jesus disciples in v. 20. The verb is used in no other instance of Jesus' disciples....The use of *eis to emon onoma*, 'in my name', is found only here in Matthew.⁶⁵⁷

If we turn to the question of charting the exegesis of this passage we find that there are three possible paths.⁶⁵⁸ The first sees in this passage a dependence upon the *Shekhina* traditions that are documented in later rabbinic Judaism. The second possibility sees in this passage a dependence upon the Old Testament theme of the promise concerning the presence of YHWH through His name. The third option sees in 18:20 the authorization to forgive sins in the same fashion as Jn. 20:23.⁶⁵⁹ As we shall see, upon examination, three factors weigh heavily in favor of the *Shekhina* option.

First, the author is clearly at home in the type of rabbinic thought that comes into play later on in the Second Century (and presumably existed in the First Century) and frames his thinking accordingly. An example of this is found in the immediately preceding v 18 which speaks of the power of the community to 'bind' and 'loose' the standards of community life and praxis. The term 'bind and loose' is a well-known rabbinic *terminus technicus*. Within rabbinic writings the meaning is that the person who is authorized to perform this (i.e., a rabbinic authority) can either 'bind' a behavior (i.e., prohibit the practice in question), or they can 'loose' it (i.e., making it legal, sometimes even mandatory). We see this same concern reflected clearly in Mt. 16: 13-19. In this complex Peter confesses that Jesus is the Christ, to which Jesus exclaims to Peter:

Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for this was not revealed to you by man, but by my Father in heaven. And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this Rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it. I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.

⁶⁵⁷ Stephenson H. Brooks, *Matthew's Community: the evidence of his special sayings material*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 105.

⁶⁵⁸ There is, strictly speaking, a fourth path, which Hiers advocates. He sees in the terms 'binding' and 'loosing' a reference to exorcism. However, even he recognizes that this reading is unsuitable to 18:20 and he instead restricts his attention to Mt. 16:19. See Richard H. Hiers, "'Binding' and 'Loosing': The Matthean Authorization," *JBL* 104.2 (1985): 241.

⁶⁵⁹ E. Fuchs advocates this approach. See *Studies of the Historical Jesus* (Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1964), 152. As cited in Hiers, *ibid.*, 234.

The author is clearly concerned to establish for his readers the fact that Peter has been granted the authority to institute rules of behavior and practice for the nascent Church. The author's use of this term in 18: 18 in connection with the community's decision shows quite clearly that he is thinking in a 'rabbinic' fashion at this point and applying the same terminology of authorization to the Church in its decision making process on this matter.⁶⁶⁰

The second factor is that the actual expression "where two or three are gathered" looks for all the world like an allusion to beliefs that became recorded in later rabbinic statements concerning the *Shekhina*. There are several rabbinic tractates which demonstrate this.

My first text is found in *Avoth* 3.2,6, which records the opinion of Rabbi Hananiah b. Teradion (ca.135C.E.), and Rabbi Halafta b. Dosa's commentary (*Mek.* on Ex. 20:24 and *m. 'Avot*) on what events or agents could precipitate the presence of the Divine Glory. *Avoth* 3.2 states:

R. Hananiah b. Teradion said: 'If two sit together and no words of the Law [are spoken] between them, there is the seat of the scornful,' as it is written, 'Nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.' But if two sit together and the words of the Law [are spoken] between them, then the Divine Presence (the Shekinah) rests between them, as it is written, 'Then they that feared the Lord spake to one another, and the Lord took notice and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before him, for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon His Name.'

And 3:6 reads:

R. Halafta b. Dosa of Kefer Hanania said: 'If ten men sit together and occupy themselves in the Law, the Divine Presence rests among them,' for it is written, 'God standeth in the congregation of God.' And where [do we learn of this] even of the five? Because it is written, 'And [He] has founded His group upon the earth.' And where of three? Because it is written, 'He judges among the judges.' And where of two? Because it is written, 'They that feared the Lord spoke with one another and the Lord noticed, and heard.' And where of One? Because it is written, 'In every place where I record my Name I will come unto you and I will bless you.'

These texts establish quite decisively that the author is not leaning upon Old Testament notions of presence, but rather that he is indebted to reflections and traditions that focus on the communal setting of Torah study which guarantee the presence of God. Although we have no proof that *mAvot* predates, or is co-terminous with, the creation of the Matthean saying, and although evidence of direct dependence is murky, the strong conceptual overlap between both

⁶⁶⁰ So also Davies and Allison. See W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew V. 1*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 787.

texts displays either that a common tradition stands behind both, or that both texts converge around a common concern to address notions of divine presence within their respective communities.

Although strikingly similar in wording Mt. 18:20 and *mAvot* 3.2,6 have their differences in meaning. Here I am referring to the agent that brings about the divine presence. In *mAvot* 3.2,6, it is the study and reflection upon the Torah, while in Mt. 18:20 it is the Christian community assembled *εἰς τὸ ἑμὸν ὄνομα*. How are we to interpret this passage now that we have secured the position that the author has drawn upon common or shared perceptions of the divine presence in sanctified communities?

The first question revolves around the meaning of the crucial phrase, *εἰς τὸ ἑμὸν ὄνομα*. The first possibility is that the phrase is meant to reflect the tradition that we witness in later rabbinic use whereby one rabbi speaks in the name of another. This sense appears quite unsuitable.⁶⁶¹ Another possibility is to see here a reference to gathering ‘in the name’ as reflecting the concern to gather and remember the teachings of Jesus. Those who support this possibility refer primarily to Mal. 3:16 as the background for *mAvot* 3.2,6, and indirectly Mt. 18:20. Mal. 3:16 reads, “Then those who feared the LORD spoke to one another, and the LORD gave attention and heard *it*, and a book of remembrance was written before Him for those who fear the LORD and who esteem His name.”⁶⁶²

The obvious parallels to *mAvot* 3.2,6 lead some to posit that insofar as the Name and God’s attention are bound up with teaching (i.e., the Torah), this is also what stands behind Mt. 18:20.⁶⁶³ Ruck-Schröder, for example, interprets this verse in light of Mt. 28:19 and sees in the command to baptize in the name of Jesus a clear reflection of the concern to bring the believer to submission to the commandments of Jesus. Ruck-Schröder then attempts to show that this

⁶⁶¹ I agree here with Ruck-Schröder. See *DNGJNT*, 138.

⁶⁶² Strangely, advocates of this view have overlooked what is arguably a more suitable background passage, namely Ex. 20:24b, where the text reads, “In every place where I cause My name to be remembered, I will come to you and bless you.”

⁶⁶³ So Ruck-Schröder, *ibid*, 142-144 and Gunter Bornkamm, “Die *Binds- und Lösegalt* in der Kirche des Matthäus,” in *Die Zeit Jesu. Festschrift für H. Schlier*, eds. Gunther V. Bornkamm and K. Rahner, (Freiburg, Basil, Wien: Herder, 1970), 93-107. A related claim is made by Jacob, who thinks this passage means that as people assemble together Jesus is in their midst symbolically because he is the reason for the assembly. See *ING*, 62.

interpretation also takes into account Matthean theology.⁶⁶⁴ In essence, this line of reasoning promotes the thought that the surety of the presence of Jesus is seen as something that occurs because believers have met with an orientation to his teachings.⁶⁶⁵ I think this interpretation ignores some vital matters and I cannot, therefore, agree with it.

The whole complex makes it clear that the express purpose of the assembly is to render judgment on a recalcitrant believer.⁶⁶⁶ This is the specific *Sitz-im-Leben*. Here, as I have already shown, the author makes use of very technical Jewish concepts which serve to assure the community that they have the authority to create, and enforce, communal rules of behavior. In other words, the passage takes pains to go beyond the simple adherence to the commandments of Jesus, but rather attempts to show that the community itself has authority to deal with those who did not act in accordance with its rules.

The next verse expresses the conviction that God will respect what they have determined in this matter, because they have been granted the authority to 'bind' and 'loose.' It is then that the author places in the mouth of Jesus the pledge that whatever they ask will be granted by "my Father in heaven." This latter promise serves in establishing that the decision of the community, if done in harmony (*συνφωνέω*),⁶⁶⁷ accompanied by prayer, will find a willing answer from God. And it is in connection with the certainty of answered prayer that the name of Jesus is brought into play.⁶⁶⁸ I would also add that the author has added this promise so that the community would rest assured that Jesus was present to grant the authority and power which the community needed to carry out their decision. Thus, the purpose of this complex appears to be to

⁶⁶⁴ Ibid.,

⁶⁶⁵ I also in part reject the conclusions of Dirks, who sees in the phrase a reference to the power of Jesus, and that it signals the trust which Christians have in Jesus. While I can endorse the former notion, I cannot fully endorse the latter. See Walter Dirks, "Wo zwei oder drei. Überlegungen zu Mt 18,20," in *Die Neue Gemeinde. Festschrift für Theodor Filthaut zum 60 Geburtstag Unter Mitarbeit von Walter Dirks und Johann Baptist Metz*, ed. Adolf Exeler (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald, 1968): 23-24.

⁶⁶⁶ 18:15-17 forms a pre-Matthean complex to which 18:18 clearly is related. Indeed, Lührmann has produced weighty arguments in favor of seeing 18:15-18 as a unified complex which the author took over. See Horacio E. Lona, „In meinen Namen versammelt,“ *Archives of Liturgy* 37 (1995): 379-380.

⁶⁶⁷ Luz also sees the matter this way. See Ulrich Luz, *Da Evangelium nach Matthäus. Teilband 3. Mt 18,1-25,46*, Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, ed. Norbert Brox, in connection with Otto Böcher, (Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1997), 51.

⁶⁶⁸ Ibid., 381.

assure the assembled believers of two indispensable items: first, the presence of Jesus, and secondarily, the pledge that God has granted them authority and that He will honor their requests which they ask in Jesus' name. This means that Jesus is promising his presence in order to offer his authority and power in their communal actions.

Now, Billerbeck has suggested that εἰς τὸ ὄνομα shows a rabbinic pedigree (unlike that of Heitmüller's commercial argot) which suggests in this context that all of the foregoing events are done with regard to Jesus' name.⁶⁶⁹ Even if true, this should not be taken to imply that 18:20 precludes an actual calling upon the name of Jesus to begin the assembly, or in carrying out the communal action. On the contrary, I hold it as very likely that Christian assemblies were begun with the invocation of Jesus' name, and any cultic acts were also carried out under invocation of his name, as I believe a quick examination of I Cor. 5:4 will show.

While many commentators have overlooked this possibility, Davies and Allison, although leaving the inquiry untouched, nevertheless remarked when reviewing Matt. 18:20 that "...it is worth considering whether 'in my name' is not here used as in 7:22: 'in the power of my name' (cf. I Cor. 5.4)."⁶⁷⁰ Now in some respects this gathering in the name of Jesus to decide a matter of church discipline is reminiscent of the situation in I Cor. 5: 1-4, where Paul directs the church to turn over an incestuous offender to Satan in the power of Jesus. In both cases the group assembles in the name of Jesus (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦ συναχθέντων ὑμῶν in the case of I Cor. 5:4), both have gathered to pass judgment in matters of church discipline, and in both assemblies the Lord is present (cf. 18:20 with I Cor. 5:4, "συν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου...and the power of our Lord Jesus is present").

In the light of I Cor. 5:4 it seems quite possible that the assembly in Mt. 18:20 met under invocation of Jesus' name. In short, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι is what is actually said, but εἰς τὸ ὄνομα is how one would refer to this action. Following what we have seen, the expression relates to the gathering which the community undertakes, accompanied by Jesus' presence, yet it also takes on

⁶⁶⁹ As quoted in Lona, "„In Meinem Namen Versammelt“,“ 384. Bietenhard also subscribes to this view, as does Hartman and Luz (who prefers an "um-willen" meaning). Steyn prefers a 'in the authority of' or 'representing' meaning. See "ὄνομα," 274, Hartman, "'In the Name of Jesus,' A suggestion concerning the Earliest Meaning of the Phrase," *NTS* 20 (1974): 438; Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 52, and G.J. Steyn, "To Onoma Tou Kyriou in I Cor.," in *The Corinthian Correspondence*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CXXV, ed. R. Bieringer, (Leuven: Uitgeverij, 1996), 487.

⁶⁷⁰ Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew V. II*, 789.

the shading of the notion that Jesus' name bears the power and authority to carry out the community discipline.

At this point it is useful to ask just what can be gleaned from this passage concerning the use of the name of Jesus in a cultic context. It suggests that the Christian assembly was begun under invocation of the name of Jesus in order to secure his presence and blessing. It also suggests that the name of Jesus was also periodically invoked during cultic activities at certain crucial junctures, or during certain procedures such as the juridical procedure spoken of in Mt. 18:20, in order to draw upon the power and authority of Jesus.

5) Acts 2:16-38

To begin, I want to point out that in my estimation this passage serves as the most foundational passage for understanding how the name of Jesus came to be used in various ritual and non-ritual contexts. Basically, it was the claim that Jesus' name was the sole name given to mankind for salvation that began the process which led to all the other uses of the name of Jesus. Before I look a bit closer at this passage it would be of value to gather some general observations concerning the significance and meaning of the text.

At the outset it is worth observing that seen in the light of the religious conceptions of the New Testament, the giving of the name of Jesus for the purposes of salvation is of equal or greater significance than the revelation of the divine name in Exodus. This is quite a claim and this assertion needs some justification. The key foundation for this claim is that the name of Jesus opened the door of salvation and in its scope this 'opening' reached to all mankind.⁶⁷¹ In contrast to the disclosure of the divine name to Moses, the name of Jesus was not restricted to Israel, and it allowed for all mankind to enter into a salvific relationship with God. Another feature which underscores the importance of this claim is that the author makes clear by his use of Joel that calling on Jesus' name was an eschatological event (2:17 ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις is Lucan), which produces the corollary that those who do the invoking are the eschatological people of God.⁶⁷² In this respect one invoked Jesus in part because he is coming again (Acts 22:20). Further developments along these lines are seen in that the early Church

⁶⁷¹ The claim that many languages were supernaturally manifested underscores the universality which 2:5 expresses, when it states that 'all the nations who are under heaven' can reach out to God in Jesus' name.

⁶⁷² Jewish expectations were that the fulfillment of Joel 3 was an eschatological event which was expected to save God's people. See *Num Rab.* 15: 25; *Midr. Ps.* 14: 6; & Acts 2: 17.

conflated the Day of the Lord with the promised messianic reign. For the early Church the Day of the Lord and the messianic reign are one and the same.⁶⁷³ To lay bare other features I shall need to review Joel 2: 30-32:

And I will display wonders in the sky and on the earth, Blood, fire, and columns of smoke. The sun will be turned into darkness, And the moon into blood, Before the great and awesome day of the LORD comes. And it will come about that whoever calls on the name of the LORD Will be delivered; For on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem There will be those who escape, As the LORD has said, Even among the survivors whom the LORD calls.

Several points are worth considering in this text. The first is that Joel has here written about the pouring out of God's spirit, but interpreted this event in a manner that is different from the promise found in Ezek. 39:29. Joel has set this dispensation in a context where YHWH has manifested Himself (or made His presence known) in the midst of Israel. This outpouring is, in Joel, clearly an event restricted to God's people, as both the context and 3:1ff. demonstrate. This outpouring is not to be seen as being bestowed in a random fashion, but as v.32 makes clear, this gift is for those whom YHWH calls. Indeed, those whom YHWH calls will be those who in turn call upon His name. This gracious outpouring comes in Joel hard on the heels of a new call to confess YHWH again and to hold firm to His ways (2:12-17). In fact, it is clear that those whom YHWH will call to experience His refuge from the coming distress are those who have responded to Yahweh's call for repentance and a renewed commitment to YHWH. Now, all of the foregoing renders the transference to Jesus in Acts 2: 38 all the more remarkable.⁶⁷⁴ That the author of Acts saw fit to apply Joel 2: 32 to Jesus in light of the call for a renewed confession *to* YHWH at 2:12-17 underlines that YHWH was now in the midst of His people *in* the person of Jesus and *his* outpouring of the Spirit. When we add that it is Jesus' name that now is the name of salvation we are led to the supposition that Jesus is performing what YHWH had promised to do.

Another feature is that, unlike the context in Joel, where the signs and wonder take on the shading of a concrete physical event of the outpouring of the wrath of God, Luke situates the signs and wonders in the Christ-event. Thus, the 'Day of the Lord' is here not a final catastrophe,

⁶⁷³ Ibid., 166.

⁶⁷⁴ If one follows the trail of this thinking one of the earliest literary instances is found in Luke's Gospel, where in the resurrection appearances the Risen Christ states that forgiveness of sins will be proclaimed in his name (24:47). This retroprojection of the events of Acts 2 into the time of the resurrection appearances on the part of the author hints that the earliest connection between the name of Jesus and ritual acts concerned the remission of sins.

but is instead something grounded in the revelation of God through Jesus. These signs and wonders of Joel, and in Acts, are then God “doing miracles in your midst (Acts 2:22-23).”⁶⁷⁵

Returning to Acts we find another feature worthy of notice. Besnard in his study pursued the meaning of the title ‘*kyrios*’ and determined that it had a dual meaning. The first was that it represented God. It became a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton. The second meaning, and for our purposes the most important, was that it signified God’s royal rule over the earth. In light of this distinction the transference of the title *kyrios* to Jesus allowed for, in Besnard’s words “un précieux moyen d’expression à la distinction sans rupture d’unité que la révélation du Christ introduit dans le monothéisme juif.”⁶⁷⁶ What Besnard is telling us is extremely important. The transference of ‘*kyrios*’ to Jesus allowed for a binitarian pattern of devotion to develop. The *kyrios*-title kept monotheistic scruples from being breeched and yet also made possible the view that Jesus was now the Lord of all things. In effect, God remains *theos*, while Jesus becomes *kyrios* (cf. I Cor. 8:4-6). With this perspective in hand, Besnard goes on to state that invoking the name of the Lord is first and foremost a recognition that Jesus has been made both Christ and Lord by God (Acts 2:36).⁶⁷⁷ Thus, the use of *theos* for God, and *kyrios* for Jesus reveals “la dialectique de la Révélation”⁶⁷⁸ and framed all further christological evolution. Pushing further one might say that one of the most significant christological developments can be defined as the story of how Jesus’ *kyrios*-title (in the sense of royal king) increasingly began to take on the outlines of the *theos* term. According to Besnard’s thesis, the use of texts such as Joel in early Christianity forms one of the most foundational and important events in post-Easter christological development. The use and appropriation of various *kyrios*-texts inaugurated the process whereby the Christ-event increasingly began to be interpreted in light of Old Testament

⁶⁷⁵ Perlewitz, *A Christology of the Book of Acts*, 170.

⁶⁷⁶ Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 155.

⁶⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 159.

⁶⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 158

passages which used the term Lord to refer to God. Further implications of this transference are that Jesus, in becoming *kyrios*, revealed God to mankind.⁶⁷⁹

Another aspect which we should note is that the early Christians viewed themselves as a community that called upon the name of Jesus (cf., I Cor. 1:2) in terms of the prophecy of Joel. If the author's understanding is at all reflective of this early period then the community understood itself as, "those who were being saved," (2:47), as well as those who, "call upon Thy [Jesus'] name" (9:14,21). If the author of Acts has understood this early period correctly, it is fair to say that the earliest church understood itself with respect to Joel 2:32. This observation allows for the inference that since the earliest community saw themselves as being the recipients of the prophecy of Joel,⁶⁸⁰ it is quite possible that they invoked the name of Jesus from the very first. Having put down roots, this usage was quickly transferred from invoking Jesus' name during the act of repentance, to other practices involving the name of Jesus, which we observe in the Book of Acts, from baptism to healings, from exorcism to confession. Thus, we find the grounds for my earlier contention that the use of the name of Jesus in calling out to God, as seen in Joel, formed the initial action in the earliest community and became the springboard for all other uses of the name of Jesus.

Beyond these considerations there are other features of the text which deserve to be highlighted. The first aspect is that the author demonstrates in 9:14, 21 and 22:16 that he knows the expression 'call on the name of X' as an already fixed formula of some vintage.⁶⁸¹ In order to shed light on the meaning of this phrase we must consult the LXX.⁶⁸²

When one looks into the LXX several striking patterns emerge. First, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι is most often associated with calling upon God (e.g. Gen. 4:26; 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25, just to note its occurrences in Genesis). Secondly, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι occurs in 24 different Psalms, and

⁶⁷⁹ Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 157. In this connection it is worth noting that in the Masoretic text of Joel the Tetragrammaton is used. Thus, the transference of this passage to Jesus and *his* name is quite startling.

⁶⁸⁰ Just how early a role Joel came to play is seen in Rom. 10:9-10; 13-14, where Paul, drawing upon Joel 2:32, states that those who are to be saved must call upon the name of Jesus.

⁶⁸¹ Ruck-Schröder quoting Conzelmann approvingly. See *DNGJNT*, 170 fn 43.

⁶⁸² The phrase unquestionably derives from Septuagintal influence. Steyn quotes the conclusions of Conzelmann and Parry here. See G.J. Steyn, "To Onoma Tou Kyriou in I Cor.," 482.

almost invariably it is found in the context of saving the petitioner from distress.⁶⁸³ This sense also comports well with the sense of the verb *mālat* (meaning 'to save') in the Masoretic text of Joel. As the reader may recall from my discussion of the Jewish materials, this verb denotes the sense of saving from physical distress and danger. Further substantiation for the centrality of the notion that God would save during times of physical danger, is found in the Apocrypha where we find time and again that God is called upon as Savior during times of duress (e.g. II Macc. 8:213:10; III Macc. 1:27; 5:6-9; Ps. of Solomon 5:5, 6:1, 15:1). Similarly, Greco-Roman usage mirrors what we have seen for Jewish convention. In times of duress people called upon the θεοὶ βοηθοί (assisting gods).⁶⁸⁴ Taken altogether, the evidence strongly suggests that ἐπικαλεῖσθαι generally meant to call upon a deity to secure help in times of need.⁶⁸⁵

One last matter needs to be reviewed before I move on. I refer to the curiously often overlooked (possible) connection to Zeph. 3:9. This passage promises that in the last days God will "...change the speech of the peoples to a pure speech, that all of them may call upon on the name of the Lord and serve him with one accord." We notice that the prophecy applies to all the earth ('all peoples') and demonstrates that one of the signs of the Last Days is that God's name will be called upon after God has made their 'speech pure' (glossialia?); an event that allows for the reality of service to God 'in one accord.' It seems clear enough that the authors of both Joel and Zepaniah are drawing upon a similar tradition. With that said, it is now time for me to begin my analysis of the particulars of the Petrine speech by first rehearsing the flow of its argument.

We should first note that the author's utilization of Joel does not at first blush actually seem to refer to Jesus, especially when we remember that in its original context the citation about "calling upon the Name of the Lord" refers to YHWH. However, there is no doubt that Jesus is the referent, for elsewhere in Acts Jesus is heralded as the Lord who is to be called upon (e.g.

⁶⁸³ W.C. Van Unnik, "With All Those Who Call on the Name of the Lord," in *New Testament Age. Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke V. II*, ed. William C. Weinrich, (Macon Georgia: Mercer Press, 1984), 545.

⁶⁸⁴ Ibid., 548.

⁶⁸⁵ Rightly Van Unnik. Cullmann however believes that the expression first and foremost means to call the name out over something in order to establish possession. It is only then that one then calls upon the name of God for help. His sequence of events appears rather questionable. In addition, Cullmann derives the phrase from, "eine juristischer Fachausdruck," an unquestionably incorrect assumption given the Jewish evidence. See Oscar Cullman, "Alle, die den Namen unseres Herrn Jesus Christus Anrufen," in *Oscar Cullmann. Vorträge und Aufsätze 1925-1962*, ed. Karlfried von Fröhlich, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr: 1966), 608 and 612. For Van Unnik, Ibid, 547-548.

9:14; 22:16).⁶⁸⁶ Also, the imperative, which concludes the speech, admonishes the hearers to be baptized “into the name of Jesus” (v.38) and would thus signify that the foregoing was written with Jesus in mind. In addition, in Rom. 10:8-13, Joel is once again cited verbatim, and it is clear from the confession in v.9 that Paul is applying the demand of Joel to call upon God's name to Jesus.

To shed some further light I must draw upon Jewish exegesis of Joel, as well as examine Acts 7:59. I shall take up the Acts passage first. In Acts 7:59, Stephen, while undergoing stoning, is said to have called on (ἐπικαλούμενον) Jesus to receive his spirit and after falling on his knees he called out (v. 60, ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ) to Jesus (v.59). This passage demonstrates that ἐπικαλεῖσθαι is seen as the means of calling upon God (or in this case Jesus) in times of need (spiritual or otherwise). When we turn to Jewish sources, unfortunately we must resort to some late passages from the Talmud (*y. Ber.* 9.13), which, probably reflect an earlier view. Here we find the same belief that the only acceptable course of action in times of trouble was to call on God alone:

But in regard to God, it is not the same: if a calamity comes on a man, he should not invoke Michael or Gabriel but God who will hear it, as it is written, ‘Everyone who calls upon the Name of the Eternal one shall be saved.’

When seen in the light of Jewish perceptions, the invocation of the name of Jesus signifies that the person recognized that Jesus occupies a place of supreme authority and power; he is now both *kyrios* and *christos* (Acts 2:36). Beyond what I have already mentioned, two other observations about the speech itself are in order with respect to the claim of Acts 2: 36 that Jesus is Lord and Christ.

First, it is clear that the author's argumentation implements Ps. 16 as the proof text whereby Peter desires to demonstrate that Jesus was exalted to the position of Lord. In Ps. 16:8-11 it is clear that the person referred to here will not suffer corruption. Clearly, insofar as David is buried, he has ‘seen’ corruption, and perforce, this passage could not apply to him. Within the argument of Acts 2, in light of Jesus' resurrection, it is now clear that this Psalm can be employed with reference to him. Moreover, v. 34 appends the further observation that David refers to another Lord in Ps. 110, thus making it clear that David is not the subject under review.

⁶⁸⁶ Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 170 and Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 120.

All of this comes to a crescendo in v.32, where the author comes to the point of his argument and proclaims that Jesus has been raised from the dead in fulfillment of Ps. 16: 8-11.

What does this exaltation actually mean for the use of the name of Jesus? First, the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God makes Jesus both *kyrios* and *christos* and it is for this reason that the early Church finds justification in using Jesus' name in baptism.⁶⁸⁷ This exaltation also suggests that, since it was Jesus' name which one called upon to be saved, it is to be expected that his name came to be used from the very start of the Christian movement during the baptismal rite. The author indeed makes clear in v.38 that only those who are baptized in his name shall receive forgiveness of their sins. What this signifies is that Jesus' name is a *salvific* name. I have still to address the question of the specific christological content of the phrase and I shall turn to this question presently.

It is of utmost significance that in all of the *MT* the cultic use of the phrase קרא בשם always refers to a deity and never a human, nor any divine principal agent.⁶⁸⁸ There are rare cases where one can observe the phrase 'to call someone,' but with humans it is never utilized with the prepositional phrase 'in the name of X.'⁶⁸⁹ Likewise, neither Philo, nor Josephus, applies the full expression (i.e. call upon the name of someone) except when speaking about an invocation of God.⁶⁹⁰

As for the *LXX* we find that the various translators employed ἐπικαλέω for קרא. Furthermore, in the *LXX* the use of the middle voice is almost exclusively reserved for invocation of deity.⁶⁹¹ This is in keeping with the usage that we have seen in the *MT*. Outside of

⁶⁸⁷ Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 171.

⁶⁸⁸ Or so Davies, *Name and Way of the Lord*, 107.

⁶⁸⁹ In Acts 25:11 Paul "calls on Caesar," but not on his name. In Josephus' *B.I* 2.294 Josephus says that the Jews "invoked the name of Caesar" to secure relief from the pillaging of the Temple by Florus. Here we see the meaning of an appeal to someone (not unlike Paul's appeal to Caesar; Acts 25:11), a function related to invocation, but not exactly the same thing either (in any event the word is ἀνακαλέω and not ἐπικαλέω). In contrast, Dio Cassius can speak in his *Historia Romanae* (54.24) of θυσίαι μὲν τῷ τοῦ Ἀγρίππου ὀνόματι, but certainly no invocation is meant here. Thus, 'calling upon' either the name of someone or 'calling upon' a person, when applied in the middle voice appears to be a *terminus technicus* reserved almost solely for divine interaction.

⁶⁹⁰ Davies, *Name and Way of the Lord*, 117.

⁶⁹¹ Ibid. By Davis' count some 114 cases of the middle occur in the *LXX*. All but 11 refer to invoking a deity.

the Bible we see that the invocations of the *PGM*, as well as other magical texts, are almost exclusively in the middle voice.⁶⁹²

With this in mind, it is important to note that all New Testament references to calling upon the name of Jesus employ the middle voice. In this context it is also important not to overlook the fact that the LXX provided the theological thought world from which the early Church formed its christological, ecclesiological, and pneumatological doctrines.⁶⁹³ Given that the early Church cut its teeth on the LXX we must assume that the application of the formula ‘call upon the name of the Lord’ must mean that it carries the same theological baggage as the Septuagintal invocation of the name of God. That is, it is hard to resist the conclusion that the use of phrase by the early Church in relation to Jesus is tantamount to an invocation of a divine being.

Now it is worth noting that the tradition concerning the Day of the Lord depicts this event as the personal coming of YHWH.⁶⁹⁴ This belief was transferred to Jesus by the early Church and is at the root of Synoptic claim that John the Baptist was Elijah *redivivus*, the forerunner of YHWH. In short, we can see that Jesus represents God in a manner which suggests that he is part of the divine identity.

A further observation has been made by Turner,⁶⁹⁵ who suggests that Acts 2: 32ff intimates more than a quick read would indicate. The argument which Turner advances here is twofold. First, the text explicitly links Jesus’ resurrection to his exaltation. They are in effect one and the same. In this vein, Jesus’ ascent not only entailed the enthronement of Jesus to God’s right hand, but he also received the promise of the gift of the Spirit. Turner sees Ps 67:19 (LXX) behind the assertion in Acts 2:33 that Jesus had been exalted with a resultant reception of spiritual gifts (i.e. ἀνέβη εἰς ὕψος, ἡχμαλώτευσας αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ γὰρ ἀπειθοῦντες τοῦ κατασκηνώσαι. κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός).

⁶⁹² As one exorcistic *lamella* from Beirut illustrates: ἐπικαλοῦμαι τὸν καθήμενον. As quoted in Kotansky, “Greek Exorcistic Amulets,” 273. See also the examples of the texts from the Leiden collection which are given in Heitmüller, *INJ*, 209-10. In the *PGM* see VII.756 and VIII.26, among numerous other examples.

⁶⁹³ Jacob, *ING*, 130.

⁶⁹⁴ Von Rad, *Old Testament*, V. II, 119.

⁶⁹⁵ M.M.B. Turner, “The Spirit of Christ and Christology,” in *Christ the Lord: Studies presented to Donald Guthrie*, ed. H.H. Rowden, (Leicester: IVP Press, 1982), 168-190.

Now many Jews saw the reception of the Spirit as something reserved for the last days.⁶⁹⁶ Furthermore, the Messianic Age, which had now been conflated with the Day of the Lord, could have been viewed by the disciples as having ushered in the outpouring of the Spirit, as Isaiah 48:16 suggests, “And now the Lord God has sent me [the Servant of YHWH], and His Spirit.”⁶⁹⁷ In light of what we have already observed with respect to baptism, we would do well to consider the possible christological ramifications of the dispensation of the Holy Spirit for those who ‘confess the name of the Lord.’

Turner calls upon certain Targumic renderings of Psalm 68:19 (*MT*) which thrust Moses in the role of the one who ascends on high and receives the gift of Torah, which he then duly dispenses to mankind. In similar fashion, Turner sees this typology behind Peter’s perception that the bestowal of the Spirit was accorded to Jesus as an epiphenomenon of his exaltation.⁶⁹⁸ Turner’s analysis is also heavily dependant upon the obvious fact that such expressions as, ‘the Spirit of Jesus’ (Acts 16:7),⁶⁹⁹ ‘the Spirit of Jesus Christ’ (Phil. 1:19), ‘the Spirit of His Son’ (Gal. 4:6), and ‘the Spirit of Christ’ (Rom. 8:9) seem to imply that Jesus also controls the Holy Spirit. He sees these expressions as directly exposing the underbelly not only of the early Church’s pneumatology, but also of an incipient Spirit Christology. As Turner encapsulates the matter, “Pre-Christian Judaism speaks of a Messiah of the Spirit, not of the Spirit of the Christ.”⁷⁰⁰ Turner posits that Jesus was envisioned as the Lord of the Spirit with virtually sole discretion of the dispensation of the Spirit.⁷⁰¹ Consequently, if one can really say that Jesus controlled the Spirit of God then one can also say that Jesus acts as God does.⁷⁰²

⁶⁹⁶ *II Macc.* 7: 23, 14: 46.

⁶⁹⁷ Given the ubiquitous interlacing of the Servant Songs among various New Testament writings it may be that when the essential equation was performed, (i.e. Jesus=The Servant) the disciples could then view passages such as 48:16 as relating to Jesus.

⁶⁹⁸ Davies has put his finger on an even more obvious connection with Ps. 16:11b, where the author believed that this verse, which promises the resurrected One joy by virtue of God’s presence, should be linked with the Holy Spirit and accordingly Jesus the Messiah was granted the Holy Spirit to pour out on mankind. See Davies, *Name and Way of the Lord*, 125.

⁶⁹⁹ No more compelling example of the belief that the Holy Spirit was also the Spirit of Jesus than an examination of the previous verse. At verse 6, the author claims that God’s Spirit prohibited Paul’s group from proceeding into Asia, while the next verse states that the Spirit of Jesus prohibited Paul’s group from entering into Bithynia.

⁷⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 183.

What ever else may be said, the Marcan conception that Jesus is the one who baptizes the elect with the Holy Spirit (Mk. 1:8) comports well with Turner's construct. Along similar lines the author of Acts claims that Jesus promised to baptize them in the Holy Spirit in a way which seems to imply that Jesus is the baptizer (Act 1:5; cf. Lk. 3:16).

Moreover, in the Johannine view Jesus is said to be the grantor of the Spirit (14:26; 15:26; 16:7). Indeed, in Jn. 14:26 the Spirit comes in Jesus' *name*, 'the Helper, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name...'. This claim is congruent with the view delivered in the Book of Acts, where those who call on Jesus' name during baptism receive the Spirit.

In summary, in the context of cultic or ritual practice it is evident that Christians called upon the name of Jesus to receive the benefits of salvation and the reception of the Spirit. Jesus' name, and his alone, could bestow the benefits of salvation. Accordingly, Jesus' name is a salvific name.

6) Rev 19.11-16

To begin with, it should appear evident that this passage contains some of the most suggestive and evocative *Namenchristologie* in all of the New Testament. The passage reads:

And I saw heaven opened; and behold, a white horse, and He who sat upon it *is* called Faithful and True; and in righteousness He judges and wages war. 12 And His eyes are a flame of fire, and upon His head are many diadems; and He has a name written upon Him which no one knows except Himself. 13 And He *is* clothed with a robe dipped in blood; and His name is called The Word of God. 14 And the armies which are in heaven, clothed in fine linen, white and clean, were following Him on white horses. 15 And from His mouth comes a sharp sword, so that with it He may smite the nations; and He will rule them with a rod of iron; and He treads the wine press of the fierce wrath of God, the Almighty. 16 And on His robe and on His thigh He has a name written, "KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.

Before I explore the various titles that are given in this text the overarching theme of this passage must be discussed. In this passage Jesus is portrayed as the conquering Messiah who shall overcome his enemies. This impression derives from 19:14 and 19:15, where Jesus is said to come with heavenly armies (τὰ στρατεύματα τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ), and to have a sharp sword coming from his mouth in order to smite the nations. It is also said that Jesus will rule with an iron rod (19:15b), and tread the winepress of judgment; imagery which symbolizes the

⁷⁰¹ In this assertion Turner is supported by Haenchen, *Acts*, 183.

⁷⁰² Turner, *ibid.*, 183.

wrath of God (19:15c). Verse 19:15c is an allusion to Isa. 62: 2-3, where the notion of treading the winepress functions as a metaphor for the wrath and judgment of God. The statement that Jesus' garments are red with blood alludes to Isa. 63:1-3. The text reads:

Who is this who comes from Edom, With garments of glowing colors from Bozrah,
This One who is majestic in His apparel, Marching in the greatness of His strength? "It is I who speak in righteousness, mighty to save." 2 Why is your apparel red,
And your garments like the one who treads in the wine press? 3 "I have trodden the wine trough alone, And from the peoples there was no man with Me. I also trod them in My anger, And trampled them in My wrath; And their lifeblood is sprinkled on My garments, And I stained all My raiment.

These verses, in conjunction with Isa. 62:2-3, portray Jesus as the victorious Lord who triumphs over the enemies of God and ushers in God's judgment. The author in effect has Jesus play out God's role. The Old Testament passages of course prophesy that YHWH will carry out this divine wrath, but the author of Revelation replaces YHWH with Jesus. For the purposes of my investigation I need to ascertain what exactly is meant by the 'hidden name,' as well as to unpack what the meaning and significance of the names that are stated here ("Word of God" and "King of Kings and Lord of Lords").

The question concerning the nature of the hidden name admits itself of several conjectural solutions. One conjecture of some interest in my investigation is the proposal that the secret name of Jesus is actually YHWH; at least according to Ulrichsen.⁷⁰³ Ulrichsen states:

An welchen geheimnisvollen Namen ist hier gedacht? Einige meinen, dass dieser Name in der Fortsetzung enthüllt wird. Sie sehen die Lösung entweder in V. 13: 'ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ,' oder in V.16: 'βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ κύριος κυρίων.' Im Gegensatz zum Wortlaut des Textes bleibt der Name dann gar nicht unbekannt!...Die gewöhnlichste Auslegung ist, hervorzuhaben, dass es das Unverständliche der Natur des Sohnes Gottes bezeichnet. Ich glaube, dass einige ältere Ausleger (z.B. Ewald und Volkmar) richtig gesehen haben, wenn sie hier den Namen 'YHWH' gefunden haben.

In an attempt to corroborate this postulate Ulrichsen notes the same divine predication accorded Jesus are also made of YHWH elsewhere in either the Apocalypse itself or the Old Testament. By this reckoning we observe that Jesus is referred to as "the beginning and the end" (1:17; 2:8; 22:13), just as YHWH is (1:8; 21:6). Jesus' title in 19:16, "King of King and Lord of

⁷⁰³ Ulrichsen, so too Fossum. See Ulrichsen, "Διαφορώτερον ὄνομα in Hebr. 1,4 Christus als Träger des Gottesnamens," 68-69 and Jarl Fossum, "In the Beginning was the Name," 116. One aspect that should be noted is that in 1 Enoch 69:14-29, the 'hidden name' of the Son of Man is said to be revealed by his actions in the judgment that is to come. This forms a very close analog to the verses here, since both are bound up with future judgment and a 'hidden name.'

Lords,” is also attributed to YHWH in Dan. 2:47 (LXX). Further corroboration for the view that the phrase “King of Kings and Lord of Lords” is a title for God can be found by consulting both the LXX and the Qumran documents. At Qumran the phrase is applied to YHWH with some frequency (e.g., *4Q381 Frags.* 76-7.7; *4Q403 col.* 1.34; *4Q511 Frag.* 8.12), while within the LXX, II Macc. 13:4 and III Macc. 5:35 refer to YHWH by recourse to this phrase. Moreover, the phrase “Faithful and True” is also an Old Testament name for God.⁷⁰⁴

Following this trail of overlapping predications between Jesus and YHWH, Ulrichsen’s response to the enigma of the meaning of the ‘unknown name’ is to propose that the key is found at 14:1 where we read:

And I looked, and behold, the Lamb was standing on Mount Zion, and with Him one hundred and forty-four thousand, having His name and the name of His Father written on their foreheads.

Ulrichsen correctly points out that the proper Old Testament hermeneutical horizon for this passage is found at Ex. 28:36, where the high priest wore a golden diadem which was engraved with the phrase *קדש ליהוה*. Another passage which illuminates this passage is Wis. 18:24 where the text states, “Your Majesty [that is, YHWH] was written on the diadem of his [the high priest’s] head.” In light of what we have seen in this same respect concerning Josephus’ and Philo’s claim that the diadem of the High Priest had the divine Name inscribed upon it, one is tempted to infer that the author, by conjoining the name of Jesus *with* the Father, has indeed elevated the name of Jesus to equality with the Tetragrammaton. Although tantalizing in certain respects, Ulrichsen’s proposal is not the sole path to a solution.⁷⁰⁵ Other clues exist which may point us in the right direction.

⁷⁰⁴ G.K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation. A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1999), 954.

⁷⁰⁵ Indeed, I side with Ruck-Schröder on this point. She correctly points out that the author of the Book of Revelation consistently differentiates between God and Jesus. Although this would not necessarily prohibit the transference of the Tetragrammaton to Jesus here, I think that in the absence of other corroborative data we should avoid this construal of the meaning of the hidden name.

In contrast to Ulrichsen, Aune puts forth the suggestion that Rev. 2:17 offers the closest verbal parallel to the wording of 19:12, and thus offers some prospect of helping us uncover its meaning.⁷⁰⁶ Here the text reads:

He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches. To him who overcomes, to him I will give some of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and a new name written on the stone which no one knows but he who receives it.⁷

Aune also points approvingly to Rev. 3:12, where it is said that Jesus will write his own “new name,” the name of the heavenly Jerusalem, and the name of God, upon triumphant Christians. Aune also notes that the very fact that the rider possess a ‘hidden’ name implies that he is a divine being of some sort (cf. Gen. 32:29; Jud. 13:17-18). Aune also draws attention to the well-known belief in antiquity that the ‘true’ names of the gods were known only to themselves, while humans use either names that derive from human conventions, or for knowledgeable adepts, names received by revelation from the gods themselves.⁷⁰⁷

Now, Aune underscores the fact that the phrases “from his mouth comes a sharp sword” and “His name is called the Word of God” reflect the same sort of imagery found in *Wis. of Sol.* 18: 15-16. The passage, as Aune cites it, reads:

The all-powerful word [ὁ παντοδύναμός σου λόγος] leaped from heaven, from the royal throne, into the midst of the land that was doomed, a stern warrior carrying the sharp sword [ξίφος ὀξύ] of thy authentic command, and stood and filled all things with death, and touched heaven while standing on the earth.⁷⁰⁸

The context in Wisdom is that of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt by God. This fits well with the theme of judgment that frames Rev. 19:11-16. If we take the context of Rev. 19:11-16 as our guide, the name suggests that Jesus, as the Word of God, bears the divine authority and power, in this case to carry out the wrath of God. Other connections are that the phrase “Word of God” means that Jesus is the sword of God to effect judgment. The metaphor of the divine word being like a sword is supported not only by the citation above, but also by Heb. 4: 12 which states, “For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the

⁷⁰⁶ David E. Aune, *Revelation 17-22*, Word Biblical Commentary 52c, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Pub., 1998), 1055. Aune regards 12c as a later addition, but this does not impact my investigation. Whenever 12c came to be written, it was certainly within the time frame of my examination.

⁷⁰⁷ Ibid., 1056.

⁷⁰⁸ Ibid.

thoughts and intents of the heart.”⁷⁰⁹ This metaphor aptly fits into the larger backdrop of judgment. In short, Jesus, as the Word of God, will bring about victory and carry out the divine judgment.

The last title or name which Jesus is said to possess is that of “King of King and Lord of Lords.” As we have already seen this title comes from the Old Testament where it is applied to God. Earlier at Rev. 17: 14 this same title/name is applied to Jesus as the One who will be victorious. Interestingly, it is claimed that this name is on his thigh and upon his robe. Aune attempts to draw out the significance of this placement of the name by indicating that several Greco-Roman authors have recorded that several statues were known which had an inscription written upon the thigh of the statue. The relative infrequency of this practice, and the fact that the thigh portion of these statues may have offered the easiest place to record some saying or prayer, not to mention that Aune does not cite any literary parallels, compels one to look for other possibilities.

One possible clue to unlocking the meaning of the placement of the name upon the thigh of Jesus is provided by a fragment from the *Orphic Hymns*. In an engrossing parallel to the imagery of Rev. 19:16, where the author states that Sabazios⁷¹⁰ is said to have the name of another god inscribed upon his thigh in an apparent effort to signify their unitary existence:

To Sabazios (with offering of styrax): Hear O father Sabazios, son of Kronos, famed spirit who sewed into his thigh [the name] Bacchic Dionysus, the loud-yelling Erapiotes...come to those who perform the mystic rites.⁷¹¹

This fragment might be taken to imply that the title for God is on Jesus’ thigh to demonstrate that God and Jesus are ‘one.’

Another insight may be offered by the strange text in *Pistis Sophia* (ch. 28), where Jesus has the names of the elemental forces of the cosmos upon his garment, and this causes them to worship. The text reads:

Jesus continued again with the discourse...Hear concerning the things which happened to me among the archons of the twelve aeons, and all their archons and their lords and their powers and their angels and their archangels. Now when they saw the garment of light

⁷⁰⁹ New King James Version.

⁷¹⁰ Sabazios was a Phrygian chthonic god associated with snakes.

⁷¹¹ As quoted in MacMullen, Ramsay, and Eugene N. Lane, *Paganism and Christianity 100-425 C.E.*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992): 56.

which was upon me...each one of them saw the mystery of his name which was in the garment of light which was upon me. They all prostrated themselves together and they worshipped the garment of light....For they contemplated the mystery of their name in my garment and they tried to come to worship the mystery of their name in my garment... Both the *Orphic Hymn* fragment⁷¹² and *Pistis Sophia* seem to suggest that having the name of another celestial being upon the thigh or garment suggests that the person or being who bears the names upon their thigh or garment has some type of intimate relationship with the beings so named, or that the person who has the names is in a superior position to whose names are found on the garments. Taken together, these texts perhaps suggest that the placement of the name 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords' upon Jesus' thigh and garment implies that Jesus is one with YHWH (or the Father) and has the authority not only to bear his name (cf. Phil. 2:9), but also to reveal it to others (cf. Jn. 17:26).

Beyond the religious-historical background, there is yet another aspect which can illuminate the meaning of the hidden name. Beale draws attention to the fact that 19:12 and 19:16 form a chiasmic structure. At verse twelve we read, ἔχων ὄνομα γεγραμμένον, while at 19:16 we find ἔχει...ὄνομα γεγραμμένον. Further points of contact are that the unknown written name (v.12) is revealed (as the written name) in verse 16. Verse 13a, represents Jesus as the rider with a bloodstained garment, while v.15b provides the image of Jesus treading the winepress. Finally, verse 13b also states that Jesus is the Word of God, while v.15a completes the metaphor by stating that a sword issues forth from Jesus mouth. The last verse to be dealt with, v. 14, is "The centerpiece of the chiasm...so that the focus is on the saints, whose faith and righteousness will be vindicated by Christ's judicial activities."⁷¹³

Beale's argument is persuasive and allows us to infer that the 'hidden name' is in fact "King of Kings and Lord of Lords." As for any connection between the name/title 'Word of God,' "Faithful and True," and the 'hidden name,' Beale points positively to the fact that both the verses which bear these expressions form an inclusio. The first term, 'Faithful and True,' and the last term, 'King of Kings and Lord of Lord,' are both introduced by καλέω, and the middle of this complex is formed by the unknown written name. According to this reckoning, the 'hidden name' would also include all the other names/titles which are found in this complex. Given that

⁷¹² Although late, Plato knows Orphic traditions and Porphyry demonstrates that he was familiar with the actual hymns.

⁷¹³ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 956.

the name/title "Faithful and True" is also an Old Testament description of God, and that Jesus is placed in God's stead in the fulfillment of judgment of Isa. 63:13, we can infer that the author sees Jesus as functioning in the role of YHWH Himself. And it can be confidently said that the name/title "Word of God" at the least bears divine overtones.

In light of Beale's work I think that we can dispense with Ulrichsen's position that the 'hidden' name was YHWH. Certainly, it is true that the name/title 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords,' as well as 'Faithful and True,' were references to God in the Old Testament, and it is possible that these names/titles function here very much like the Tetragrammaton would in other contexts. In this section of Revelation Jesus is portrayed as the ultimate divine warrior, well able to dispense divine justice. The title/name 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords' fits nicely into this motif. Nonetheless, the name/title belonged to YHWH no less than did the Tetragrammaton. Only in this sense then; that is, the fact that Jesus is able to carry a divine title upon his person strongly implies that Jesus now shares in the divine identity, a placement that also carries with it the conclusion that Jesus shares, in an unique way, the authority and power of YHWH Himself.

Finally, in terms of ritual acts, it would seem probable that Jesus, as the divine warrior, worthy to bear the divine names/titles and worthy of obeisance (e.g. Rev. 5: 11-14), should also have his name invoked in cultic contexts, for he alone bore the divine *exousia* and *dynamis*.

NON-CANONICAL SOURCES

Beyond New Testament texts we find several works which draw our interest. The first text is found in I Clement, a work that contains several passages that incorporate the name-concept in both liturgical and non-liturgical contexts. It is important to observe that liturgical material is, as a rule, quite conservative. Quite possibly then, given the early date of the correspondence,⁷¹⁴ and the traditional nature of this material, the name-concept displayed here dates to possibly the mid-first Century C.E. at the latest.

We first encounter the name-concept in I Clement, within a hortatory section which exhorts its listeners to “be obedient to His most holy (παναγίω) and glorious (ἐνδόξω) Name” (LXIII, 1).⁷¹⁵ Additionally, within the final liturgical prayer the stanza recounts that, “...we render obedience to Thine all powerful (παντοκρατορι) and most excellent (παναρέτω) Name” (LX, 4).

The author augments this simple admonishment concerning obedience to the Name by summoning his readers to trust in the Name. The author speaks of “trusting (πεποιθότες) in the most holy Name of his majesty” (LVIII, 1).⁷¹⁶ The next section then contends that God has “called us...from ignorance to the full knowledge of the glory of his Name.” (LIX, 1), and in a move to direct discourse the author writes, “...we may set our hope on your Name, which is the primal source (ἀρχέγονον) of all creation” (LIX, 3). Now it should be noted that this ἀρχή conception has a striking analog in the pre-Johannine Logos hymn (Jn 1:1-18), and the common positioning of Jesus as the medium through whom all creation was brought into being (e.g., I Cor 8:6; Heb.1:2 and Col. 1:16).⁷¹⁷ It also bears comparison with Philo’s conception, at *Conf. Ling.* 146, where Philo equates the “Beginning” with the name of God.

At first blush none of these passages seem to intimate directly a reference to Jesus. Daniélou, who champions the notion that Jesus’ name stands behind these references, admits as

⁷¹⁴ Approximately 95 C.E. following standard conventions.

⁷¹⁵ The outline for this review is indebted to the excursus of Daniélou whom I shall follow closely. See Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, (Chicago: The Henry Regnery Co., 1964), 149-163.

⁷¹⁶ The author may here be reliant upon Is. 50:10. Per Daniélou, *ibid.*, 151.

⁷¹⁷ Gräßer correctly points out that these various passages witness to the antiquity of this theologoumenon. See Eric Gräßer, “Hebräer 1,1-4. Ein exegetischer Versuch,” in *Text und Situation, Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, (Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1973), 191.

much.⁷¹⁸ Still, as he points out, the ὄνομα ἀρχέγονον has strong similarities to the Johannine doctrine of the creative agency of the Logos, who also is from the ἀρχή. Moreover, as we shall see in the work of Arai,⁷¹⁹ a similar use of the Name is found in the *GT*, and in an unambiguous manner which demonstrates, there at least, that the Name is Jesus.⁷²⁰ Also, we must bear in mind that both documents derive from a milieu influenced by Jewish-Christian speculation. All of these considerations lend some credence to Daniélou's position. This conclusion is strengthened even more when we look for analogs in other early Christian documents for the formula Jesus=Name=Creator.

Looking to other texts we find similar themes as those that we witnessed in *I Clement*. For example, in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the attribute of sustaining the world is attested (*Sim.* IX, 14.5):

The name of the Son of God is great and infinite and sustains (βαστάζει) the whole world. If then all creation is sustained by the Son of God, what do you think of those who bear the name of the Son of God?

Furthermore, *Shepherd of Hermas Vis.* III, 3:5 makes the claim that the Church itself is also built upon the name of Jesus. The text reads, "The Tower (i.e. the Church) has for its foundation the word of the Almighty and Glorious (ἔνδοξος) Name, and is strengthened by the invisible power of the Master." One feature of note here is that the Name, just as in *I Clement* is described as ἔνδοξος and παντοκράτωρ. The fact that the Church is said to rest on the 'foundation' of the Name, when taken with the previously quoted passage (IX, 14.5), allows for the conclusion that the name of Jesus is here thought of as the Name which, by virtue of its power, sustains the world (cf. Col. 1:17) and forms the foundation for the existence of the Church.⁷²¹

This chorus of examples invites us to take seriously the notion that within some Christian circles either "Jesus," as the name of God, or alternatively the name of Jesus, had been granted

⁷¹⁸ Daniélou, *Jewish Christian Theology*, 151.

⁷¹⁹ Sasagu Arai, *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964).

⁷²⁰ *GT* 38:9.

⁷²¹ Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 152.

the mediatory role in creation, or in some cases its continuing coherence; a role formerly credited to the Tetragrammaton.

In other texts we find different, but no less striking, claims for the name of Jesus. We note the Christian interpolation in the *Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers* 1.2, where a makarism is offered to God for “Jesus Christ our savior, on behalf of your holy Name, which you caused to encamp among us.” A direct equation is erected here which equates the name of God *with* Jesus.⁷²² An almost exactly similar phrase is found in the *Didache* ch. 10, where the author gives thanks to God, “for your holy Name that You made to tabernacle in our hearts.”⁷²³

The next text that will help us track the name-concept in Christian conventicles is the *Odes of Solomon* (hereafter *OS*). The text contains abundant evidence that the name-concept was undergoing alteration and adaptation and found expression in the cult of the community which created the document.⁷²⁴ If, as seems likely, *OS* was penned independently from any direct reliance upon the New Testament⁷²⁵ then this text offers prime evidence that the name-concept was evolving in various Christian conventicles.

In *OS* (8.19, 22) the Odist, speaking *ex ore Christi*, expresses the claim that the elect ones will not be deprived of Jesus’ name, and then when reverting back to the first person as the speaker he exclaims that the elect shall be found ‘uncorrupted’ forever. In an obvious parallel to both Ez. 9:4 and Rev. 14:1 (cf. 3:12), Jesus places his name upon the (fore) heads of those who belong to him (42:20).

In a particularly fascinating portion of the *OS* (23) the claim is made that the very thoughts of God “were like a letter” (v.5) which everyone sought after in order to read, and thereby know the mind of God (v. 10). This ‘letter’ is described as having “the Name of the

⁷²² It should be noted, however, that this passage can also be read to mean that Jesus came for the sake of God’s name, a reading quite in keeping with Old Testament notions.

⁷²³ So E. Peterson, as quoted in Fossum, “In the Beginning was the Name,” 123 fn. 59. Peterson is probably correct here in seeing a reference to Jesus. Fossum quotes from “Didachè cap. 9 e 10”, *EL* 58 (1944): 6. The rationale for seeing the Name as referring to Jesus is that this thanksgiving prayer comes directly after the Eucharist. Also, the event is conceived of as an internal event, an interpretation in keeping with Christian belief that Jesus lives in the heart of believers.

⁷²⁴ For a brief review of how these cultic hymns functioned and their place within worship see, David Aune, *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), 174-182.

⁷²⁵ This is forcefully argued by Charlesworth and accepted by the present author. For further details see Charlesworth, “The Odes of Solomon,” 726-727.

Father upon it, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (v. 22). Here the purpose of the names is to function as a ‘seal’ for the very thoughts of God.

Moving on we find a marked analog to the claim that Jesus is equal to the name of the Father in Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* (75), where Justin pours this theologoumenon into a remarkable christological mould. The passage reads:

Now from the book of Exodus we know that Moses cryptically indicated that the Name of God himself (which He says was not revealed to Abraham or to Jacob) was also Jesus. For it is written: ‘And the Lord said to Moses, say to this people: Behold, I send my angel before thy face, to keep thee in thy journey, and bring thee into the place that I have prepared for thee. Take notice of him, and obey his voice; do not disobey him, for he will not pardon thee, because My Name is in him.’ Consider well who it was that led your fathers into the promised land, namely he who was at first named Auses (Oshea), but later renamed Jesus (Joshua). If you keep this in mind, you will also realize that the Name of him who said to Moses, ‘My Name is in him,’ was Jesus. For, indeed He was also called Israel, and Jacob’s name was changed to this also.

We should also carefully note that in this passage Jesus is equated with the Angel of the Lord, who bears the divine Name, and rather interestingly, as we shall see later, the springboard for this claim derives from Justin’s conception that Jesus is a sort of Joshua *redivivus*.

My final text comes from the well-known text *Gospel of Truth*. I am aware that I might be accused of muddying the waters when I place this text among the beliefs of so-called-orthodox Christianity. Still, there are good reasons for doing so.

Of course the problem of how, or by what criteria, one may distinguish between ‘orthodox’ and ‘aberrant’ belief systems is as old as Baur’s *Orthodoxie und Heresie*. We appreciate a bit more today that the old statement that ‘the victors write the history’ applies every bit as much to the beliefs of the early Church as it does to cultural and military history. Today, scholars such as Michael Williams have demonstrated that the term ‘gnosticism’ is a nebulous term at best and is so ill defined that it is useless.⁷²⁶ I accept Williams’ criticism and will use for the purposes of my study the term ‘non-orthodox’ in the place of the term gnosticism. I do not apply this term pejoratively, but instead only to convey the fact that the text from which I cite did not find its way into later mainstream Christianity.

In the *GT* (37:37-38:38) we find an extremely illuminating text that propounds the doctrine of the Name. I cite it here in full:

⁷²⁶ Michael Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).

...the end is the taking knowledge about the one who is hidden, and this is the Father, from whom the beginning came forth, to whom all will return who have come forth from him. And they have appeared for the glory and joy of his Name. Now the name of the Father is the Son. It is he who first gave a name to the one who came forth from him, who was himself, and he begot him as a son. He gave him his name which belonged to him; he is the one to whom belongs all that exists around him, the Father. His is the name; his is the son. It is possible for him to be seen. But the name is invisible because it alone is the mystery of the invisible which comes to ears that are completely filled with it. For indeed the Father's name is not spoken, but is it apparent through a Son. In this way, then, the name is a great thing. Who therefore will be able to utter a name for him, a great name, except him alone to whom the name belongs and the sons of the name in whom rested the name of the Father, (who) in turn themselves rested in his name? Since the Father is unengendered, he alone is the one who begot a name for himself before he brought forth the aeons, in order that the name of the Father should be over their head as lord...⁷²⁷

What should grab our attention is the explicit theologoumenon that displays the conviction that when the author speaks of the Father revealing Himself in the Son, he does so *within the context of the significance of the Name*. This significance is highlighted by the repeated claim that the name of the Father is the Son (38:38; 39:19-20; 39:25-26; 40:5; 40:24f.), a claim that we will encounter in the Church Fathers, and which we will again encounter in my examination of the Johannine materials within the New Testament. Indeed this phrase opens this section (38:6f), forms its middle core (39:19f), as well as serving as its conclusion (40:24f). This observation suggests that for this section the Name and its relationship to Jesus serves as the *raison d'être* for this composition. To unpack the significance of the claims that are found in this section, I must first examine each individual claim in order to discern the points that the author hopes to make.

The first thing to be noted in the *GT*, as Untergaßmair correctly does, is that the Name is equivalent to the very being of God.⁷²⁸ In fact, the Name is none other than the Father Himself.⁷²⁹

⁷²⁷ Translation comes from George W. MacRae, "The Gospel of Truth (I, 3 and XII, 2)," *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977), 46-47.

⁷²⁸ Untergaßmair, *INJE*, 254. Untergaßmair writes, "...der 'Name' wesentlich verbunden ist und zu seinem Wesen gehörig ist."

⁷²⁹ Ibid. "Ja dieser 'Name' ist der Vater selbst: wer nun ist es, der ihn (=den Vater) mit Namen nennen kann, ihn den großen Namen, außer ihm selbst, dem der Name gehört... (38:25). Die Wendung 'ihn den großen Namen' meint nach dem Kontext den Vater selbst und drückt daher die Identität zwischen 'Vater' und 'Name.'"

Second, it is to be observed that in the text the Son receives the name of the Father (38:7-8; 39:7; 39:18f; 39:23b; 40:9; 40:14-15; 40:27), thus establishing just how closely linked Jesus is with the Father,⁷³⁰ or as Attridge formulates this relationship “The revelatory name that the Son possesses is as much his own as it is the Father’s.”⁷³¹ The reciprocity of the terms of this arrangement are seen in that the Son is the Name because he functions in similar fashion as the Name; that is to say, he embodies that truth of the divine nature which lies behind the Name.⁷³² This equitability is shown in that the Name in the *GT* serves as a medium of revelation designed to reveal something about the mystery of the relationship between God and Jesus.

Seen in this light it appears that the name which Jesus received may have been either one familiar to us from the New Testament (e.g., Son, or perhaps Lord), or possibly even ‘Father’ (cf. *Tri. Trac.* 61.14).⁷³³ Obviously, it is to be expected that no one can express the Name except the one to whom it has been given, and following 39.30-32, it is clear that the Son can express the Name; thus again establishing that the Son bears the Name.⁷³⁴ Third, it is to be noted that only the Son is the beneficiary of this Name (39:7; 40:15). Fourth, and perhaps the most riveting assertion is that the Father has given the Son the Name before the inception of the Ages (38:35), establishing the belief in the pre-existence of the Son and accordingly, the Son’s existence prior to the creation of time.⁷³⁵

Beyond this, according to the text, the Name already existed, in some measure, in an embryonic nexus with the Son (39:13-19). It is worthy of note that this claim that the Name was in existence prior to the creation of the hylie realm is consistent with other claims concerning the

⁷³⁰ So Sasagu Arai in his section III, “Der Sohn als Name”. See *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis*, 67.

⁷³¹ Harold W. Attridge, and George W. MacRae S.J., “The Gospel of Truth 1,3:16.31-43.24,” in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex)*. Ed. Harold W. Attridge, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985), 126.

⁷³² *Ibid.*, 118.

⁷³³ So Attridge, *Ibid.*, 119.

⁷³⁴ Arai, who also draws attention to the comparative background material, also stresses this point. See *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis*, 67.

⁷³⁵ So too Untergaßmair, who states, “Aus 38,33-35 geht hervor, daß der Sohn vor den Äonen ist.” See, *INJE*, 256.

Name, which we have already encountered in other texts, such as I Enoch. These various conceptions allow us to draw two inferences.

First, the Son is 'Lord' of the creation—a concept with evident points of contact to the Johannine doctrine of the Logos.⁷³⁶ Furthermore, this doctrine appears to have further links to earlier Jewish name-speculation.⁷³⁷

Second, I take pains to observe that the same tension that exists here with the acknowledgement that the Father and Son are somehow so close that they share the same power and authority, and yet are nevertheless distinct, is mirrored yet again in the Johannine doctrine of the Logos.⁷³⁸ Arai has astutely noted that many features of the Logos, as portrayed in the Johannine Prolog, find ready parallels to the Name-conceptions found in the *GT*. He has produced a useful table which outlines this correspondence which I shall cite here only in brief: Jn. 1:1=38:9; 1:12=38:28; 1:14b=38:30; 1:14de=39:26; 1:18a=39:8,17; 40:22; 1:18b=38:23f.; 39:22; 40:27f.⁷³⁹ Among other things, the first couplet demonstrates the preexistence of the Son, while other verses show that the Logos, or the Name in the case of the *GT*, reveals the Father, and demonstrates their relationship. This parallelism is reminiscent of Philo's concept of the Logos also, as well as the function and high estimation that he assigns the Name. Whatever else may be said about Arai's proposed parallelism, his suggestion that a particular *Namenchristologie* arose through the baptismal rite in Christianity is not without some interest⁷⁴⁰

Another document with clear points of contact with the *GT* is the Epistle to the Hebrews. W.C. van Unnik set forth years ago a convincing demonstration that the author of *GT* knew the

⁷³⁶ Ibid. Untergaßmair maintains that the doctrine of the lordship over creation is advanced here, "Daraus erklärt sich auch der Gedanke, daß der Name des Vaters über dem Haupte der Äonen sein soll (vgl. 38,36-39,2). 'Herr' bezieht sich auf den 'Namen', welcher der Sohn ist. Er erscheint so als der Herr der Schöpfung.", *ibid.* For the correlative concept of the position of the Logos as Lord of creation see Kendrick Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel*, (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960), 183.

⁷³⁷ Lastly, I draw attention to verses 20-21, where the Name is said to be prohibited to be vocalized. This clearly reflects the prior Jewish belief that the Name was not to be expressed. See Attridge, "The Gospel of Truth," 120, and Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth*, 183.

⁷³⁸ As Grobel notes concerning this similar tension, "the same paradox as in John 1:1: there the Logos is *with* [emphasis Grobel's] God and therefore distinct from him, but also *is* [emphasis Grobel's] God and therefore [is] one with him. Here he came out of the Father (distinct) and yet is the same (identical)." See Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth*, 181.

⁷³⁹ Arai, *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis*, 70.

⁷⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 72.

Epistle.⁷⁴¹ Later Søren Giversen extended this research concerning *GT* 38.⁷⁴² Giversen's work pointed out that Heb. 1:5, where the text states, "Thou art my Son, This day have I begotten thee," is echoed in *GT* 38, 10-12, where the text reads, "He [God] begat [Jesus] as a Son. He gave to him His name which belonged to Him..." In the context of Hebrews the author's argument is that Jesus receives from God (inherits) the most excellent name because Jesus, as the Son, has obtained a greater inheritance than the angels by virtue of his redemptive work. Giversen further points out that whereas in Hebrews Jesus inherits the name, in *GT* the Name is Jesus' "property,"⁷⁴³ for *GT* 38,11 says the "name belonged to him."⁷⁴⁴ Another even more significant reflection of the theology of Hebrews can be found when we compare Heb. 1:4 and *GT* 38, 6-7. In the former we read that Jesus is the "effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance" and it is this expression for the divine reality which helps to justify in the author's mind Jesus' inheritance of the *διαφορώτερον* name. When we turn to examine *GT* 38, 6-7, we find that Jesus is represented as the visible expression of deity, as the Son, for the text reads, "It is possible for them to see him, but the name on the other hand is invisible." This emphasis on Jesus as the revelation of God is again highlighted at 38,15-17, where the text reads, "For, indeed, they do not name the Father, but He reveals himself by a Son." Here, we find clear echoes of the same sort of 'Jesus-as-reflection-of-God' thinking that forms the basis for Heb. 1:3. Although we possess no evidence of direct literary dependence, the author appears to have in the back of his mind many of the themes and theological concerns of Hebrews, perhaps reflecting a common tradition.

In any event, it is worth noting that this sort of name speculation streams from a Jewish well which dates from the early Hellenistic period, and draws upon that strand of tradition where an angel receives the name of God (3 *Enoch* 12; *Apoc. Abr.* 10, and *PS* 7), and correspondingly,

⁷⁴¹ W.C. van Unnik, "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament," in *The Jung codex, a newly recovered Gnostic papyrus; three studies*, (London, Mowbray; New York, Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1955): 79-129.

⁷⁴² Søren Giversen, "Evangelium Veritatis and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Studia Theologica* 13.2 (1959): 87-96. In what follows I shall borrow from the text as cited in Giversen.

⁷⁴³ *Ibid.*, 89.

⁷⁴⁴ *Ibid.* This text is that of Giversen.

His authority.⁷⁴⁵ Such speculation also appears to lie behind the various early Christian texts that speak of Jesus as having received the divine name. Clearly these non-canonical texts draw upon both Jewish and Christian name speculation.

SUMMARY

We have seen that various early Christian texts reflect the belief that Jesus had been given a special name by God, both at birth, as well as after the resurrection. One passage in particular, Phil. 2:9, conveys the sense that Jesus had received the divine name of God. In a related fashion, other texts, such Rev. 19:16, apply names/titles to Jesus which are reserved for God, or apply names/titles which suggest that Jesus was divine. These texts strongly intimate that the earliest Christians felt comfortable applying to Jesus names and titles normally reserved for God.

We have also reviewed texts, such as Acts 2:38, which highlight the belief that the name of Jesus had become a salvific name for all mankind. In addition, we have encountered texts, such as Eph. 1:21, which show that the early Christians believed that Jesus' name was a name of power and authority, extending over all the created order. Moreover, as texts such as Mt. 18:20 demonstrate, the use of the name of Jesus, such as in invocation, as the name under which Christians met, testify to the belief that the name of Jesus could guarantee Jesus' presence.

Taken all together, these texts allow us to peer into the past and to glean some sense of how the earliest Christians viewed the name of Jesus—indeed how they viewed divine names in general. It is clear that the earliest Christians were no less familiar with the notion of divine and powerful names than their Jewish cousins, or Greco-Roman neighbors. In fact, they were every bit as convinced as their co-religionists that names could represent the divinity, and carry the divine numen. Accordingly, we have seen that the name of Jesus was viewed as a numinous and salvific name. Indeed, God has given Jesus his birth name as an indication of the type of role Jesus would play in salvation history. Beyond these observations, we have also encountered evidence that Jesus, as the recipient of the divine name, had now been invested with divine authority, and that Jesus' name was laden with this power, and reflected his divinely bestowed authority. These data allow us to anticipate the findings of the next chapter, viz. that the name of Jesus was used in numerous actions and contexts, especially cultic actions, and this was made

⁷⁴⁵ Attridge and MacRae, "The Gospel of Truth 1.3:16.31-43.24," 117.

possible by the belief of the early Church that the name of Jesus had attained an exalted status in the hierarchy of divine names.

Moving on, I shall now turn to the use of the name of Jesus in the first two centuries of the Common Era. I shall partition each use into its respective category. Each category will be placed into a larger subset. What I mean here is that the use of the name of Jesus can be divided into three major camps. The first use is that of drawing upon the power in the name of Jesus. Healings and exorcisms, for example, fall into this group. The next group are cases where the name of Jesus seems to function as a representative for Jesus himself. Practices such as praising, glorifying and thanking the name of Jesus all use the name as a symbol for Jesus himself. Another example is the special scribal treatment given to the name of Jesus in New Testament manuscripts. Here too, the Name symbolizes or represents the person. The final category is where the name of Jesus functions to mediate eschatological salvation and entry into the people of God. Examples here are the calling upon Jesus' name for salvation both within and without the baptismal rite. After each category is reviewed I shall undertake to compare this use to any corresponding Greco-Roman or Jewish usage of the names of their respective deities and how that compares to the use of the name of Jesus.

CHAPTER FIVE

PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE NAME OF JESUS

Wir finden in der Christenheit der ersten Jahrhunderte eine eigenartige Schätzung und Wertung des Namens Jesu. Die keime derselben zeigen sich bereits in den ältesten Gemeinden der apostolischen Zeit. Wahrscheinlich entstehen sie gleichzeitig mit der messianischen Gemeinde überhaupt.⁷⁴⁶

In this chapter I shall complete my examination of the Christian materials, but here I shall focus on how early Christians used the name of Jesus. I shall endeavor to establish categories of use (e.g., exorcism, healing or prophesying in Jesus' name) and to compare these categories to how Jews applied the name of God, and how Greco-Roman society applied the names of their gods. Thereafter, I shall draw my conclusions on how the use of the name of Jesus by the early Christians may reveal to us something of their christological beliefs.

I. The use of the name of Jesus as a *Machtmittel*.

EXORCISMS IN THE NAME OF JESUS

Various reports in the New Testament (e.g., Acts 19:13-17; 16:18; Mark 16:18; Lk. 10:17-20 and 9:49f.) testify to the belief that the early Church believed that demons could be cast out in the name of Jesus; accordingly, exorcism formed a core element of the Christian mission. We can peer inside this missionary world by consulting several key texts. First, around 140 C.E., Justin Martyr attempts to persuade Antoninus Pius of the truthfulness of the Christian faith by pointing out the success of Christian exorcists. Justin states:

And now you can learn this from what is under your own observation. For numberless demoniacs throughout the whole world, and in your city, many of our Christian men exorcising them in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, have healed and do heal, rendering helpless and driving the possessing devils out of the men, though they could not be cured by all the other exorcists, and those who used incantations and drugs.⁷⁴⁷

And Irenaeus, in his *Adversus Haeresies* (II.xxxii.4-5), tendered this assessment of the power of the name of Jesus in both healing and exorcism in his day:

Those who are in truth his disciples...do in his name perform [miracles]...For some do truly drive out demons, so that those who have thus been cleansed from evil spirits frequently join themselves to the Church.....Nor does she [i.e. the Church] perform anything by means of

⁷⁴⁶ Heitmüller, *INJ*, 242.

⁷⁴⁷ *Second Apol.*, VI. Justin underscores this claim yet again in his *Dialogue* 76.13.

angelic invocations, or by incantations, or by any other wicked art, but by directing her prayers to the Lord...and calling upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, she has been accustomed to performing miracles....If therefore, even now the name of our Lord Jesus Christ confers benefits, and cures thoroughly and effectively all who anywhere believe on Him, but not on Simon, or Menander, or Carpocrates...

This extraordinary claim of authority over the demonic reaches back into the New Testament itself. Lk. 9:1-2, for example, states that Jesus gave authority to the Twelve to cast out demons and then sent them out to preach the Gospel. In similar fashion, Lk. 10: 1 states that Jesus commissioned the 72 to go out into the villages and proclaim the Kingdom of God (v. 9). Later, upon their return, they rejoiced that the demons were subject to them (v. 17). In later tradition (Mk. 16:17) we see that the early Church envisioned itself as an institution 'equipped' with the name of Jesus in order to accomplish exorcism. Furthermore, in post-Apostolic times, as the above quotes demonstrate, exorcism became a major mode of demonstration of Christian power⁷⁴⁸ -a demonstration which served to fuel Christian conversion.⁷⁴⁹

Now, somewhat surprisingly, the use of the name of Jesus in exorcisms begins, or so it is reported, during Jesus' own lifetime (Gospel of Mark 9:38-39). The narrative claims that a presumably itinerant exorcist utilized the name of Jesus in his exorcisms. This claim is naturally so unexpected that it deserves to be explored in detail.

The first question to ask is: does this tradition stem from the lifetime of Jesus?⁷⁵⁰ Several considerations tend to support the conviction that the tradition behind the pericope does come from Jesus' own lifetime.

First, the presentation in this narrative, where the disciples are vying for supremacy one against the other, speaks in favor of seeing this as a pre-Easter narrative. Secondly, the general antithesis between the "generosity of spirit [of Jesus toward the exorcist] and the generally

⁷⁴⁸ Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire A.D. 100-400*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984), 27-29.

⁷⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁵⁰ As an aside, it is worth mentioning another matter. In Mk. 9:38 the un-known exorcists are said to cast out the demons ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, while Jesus, in v. 39, when referring to this activity uses ἐπὶ. Ruck-Schröder sees no distinction but I am not so sure. I think it quite possible that v.38 recounts the actual expression that was used to cast the demons out, while Jesus' statement meant that the exorcists were acting on the basis of, or with respect to, his name. A similar expression is found at Acts 3:16 where Peter explains that the miracles were being done ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ τοῦτου, that is, "on the basis of faith in his name."

exclusivist tenor of the early church.”⁷⁵¹ (in terms of who is authorized to exorcise demons) would also indicate a pre-Easter setting. Third, the story’s central interlocutor is John, who represents the concerns of the disciples, a position not otherwise elsewhere attested and this is somewhat unexpected in a post-Easter setting.⁷⁵² Furthermore, the events seem best suited to a Palestinian milieu (the picture of itinerant Jewish exorcists fits well with the general image of these exorcists elsewhere; e.g. Acts 19: 11-14; cf. Matt. 12:27, “If I cast out demons by Beelzebul by whom do your sons cast them out?”). Finally, E. Wilhelms has noted that Jesus’ response is not at all expected. Wilhelms comments:

Man hätte etwas anderes erwartet, z.B. eine Hindeutung, dass der fremde Exorzist ja wirklich auf der Seite Jesu und der Kirche im Kampfe gegen Satan und seine Dämonen stand. Stattdessen heisst es: >>und (dann) bald von mir übelreden kann<<.”⁷⁵³

This unexpected turn of events in the narrative might be argued to support a *Sitz-im-Leben* within Jesus’ own lifetime. Put in other terms, if the whole story is a creation of the early Church what was it designed to do, if not to make allowance for those who used the name of Jesus and yet were not visibly associated with the faith. If this is so, then it is a curious fact indeed that the Church did not make a more explicit claim for these exorcists in a fashion similar to what Wilhelm expected from Jesus’ response. In any event, it requires no excessive stretch of the imagination to envision a scenario whereby one, or even several, exorcists witnessed, or at a minimum heard, about the astounding exorcistic prowess attributed to Jesus and then began to utilize his name to leverage their own exorcistic attempts.⁷⁵⁴

⁷⁵¹ Nolland’s wording. See, John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34, Volume 35B, Word Biblical Commentary*, ed. Ralph Martin, (Dallas TX: Word Books Publisher, 1993), 34. Jesus’ reaction reminds one of the response of Moses in Num. 11:24-30, where we read that seventy elders had the Spirit of the Lord come to rest upon them, and in vv. 26-29:

Two men had remained in the camp; the name of one was Eldad and the name of the other Medad. And the Spirit rested upon them...and they prophesied in the camp. 27 So a young man ran and told Moses and said, “Eldad and Medad are prophesying in the camp.” 28 Then Joshua the son of Nun, the attendant of Moses from his youth, answered and said, “Moses, my lord, restrain them.” 29 But Moses said to him, “Are you jealous for my sake? Would that all the LORD’S people were prophets, that the LORD would put His Spirit upon them!”

⁷⁵² So Joachim Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus. 2. Teilband Mk 8,27-16,20* (Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1979), 61 and Eino Wilhelms, “Der fremde Exorzist [Mk 9:38-42],” *Studia Theologica* 3 (1951): 168. Gnllka, however, sees in the statement that the exorcist “does not follow *us*” instead of the expected ‘*you*’ (Jesus), as an indication of a post-Easter controversy. See pgs. 59-60.

⁷⁵³ Eino Wilhelms, “Der fremde Exorzist,” 167.

⁷⁵⁴ So also Samuel Eitrem, *Some notes on the Demonology in the New Testament*, 8. Nørgelsbach is also inclined to believe that Jesus’ name was used during his lifetime. See, *DNGJHS*, 29.

Another consideration worth mulling over is that if the story stems from Jesus' time then it is not wholly improbable that at least some early listeners understood Jesus' apparent lack of placing any specific faith claims on the itinerant exorcist as implying that his name could be utilized *ex opere operato*,⁷⁵⁵ and this creates the suspicion that Jesus' name may have been already introduced into magical circles during his lifetime--an unparalleled occurrence if true.⁷⁵⁶

Now another example of the appropriation of the name of Jesus in exorcisms is found in the narrative in Acts (Acts 19: 13-18) which deals with the itinerant Jewish exorcists who seek to use the power of Jesus "whom Paul preaches." In this connection it is noteworthy that exorcists generally were rather keen upon promoting their own formula, while oftentimes criticizing the formulas of other magicians (e.g. *PGM*. IV.2085).⁷⁵⁷ That the author of Acts nonetheless chose to use the name of Jesus in this narrative illustrates just how powerful the name of Jesus was believed to be.

The report in Lk. 9:49f. brings us to a whole different matter. Here Luke, drawing upon Mk. 9:38-41, also appears to believe that people who were unknown to the disciples could put to good effect the name of Jesus in exorcisms. Does this mean that Luke believed that the name of Jesus could be used *ex opere operato*?⁷⁵⁸ To answer this question we need to examine two things: first, the exact wording of the Lucan version at 9:49, and secondly, the reports in Lk. 9:40, Acts 19:13-18, and 8: 9-24 respectively. In the first instance the narrative reports the lack of success of the disciples to cast out demons, while the latter passages treat the unsuccessful exorcism by the Sons of Sceva and the workings of Simon the Magician. Both inquiries should help clarify the matter for us.

With respect to Lk. 9:49 it is very important to notice the subtle difference between the Marcan and Lucan versions of this story. Mark reports that John describes the unknown exorcist as being outside the disciple group ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν. Luke on the other hand emends this to read, ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν. Nolland suggests a rendering of Luke's reading as,

⁷⁵⁵ Ibid., 2.

⁷⁵⁶ Ibid., 8.

⁷⁵⁷ Ibid., 6. In *PGM* IV.2085 the magician criticizes that some spells can be too verbose.

⁷⁵⁸ Jacob clearly leaned in this direction, as did Eitrem. Delling, while thinking it possible, nonetheless rejects it in favor of seeing the exorcist as someone who in some fashion related to Jesus. See *ING*, 47f., 51; Delling, *Die Zueignung*, 46 and *Some Notes on the Demonology of the New Testament*, 2.

“Because he does not follow [Jesus] with us.” This, according to Nolland “clarifies the christological focus and makes the issue one of being (permanently) part of the disciple band.”⁷⁵⁹ If Nolland’s view of this passage is accepted, then this opens up the possibility that the author of Luke probably envisioned the consternation of the disciples as lying in their belief that the exorcist operated outside of some type of faith relationship to Jesus. This reading would weigh in favor of understanding Luke as not endorsing a mechanical use of the name of Jesus.

Another piece of evidence is found at Lk. 9:40, where we have the claim that the disciples themselves failed to exorcize demons in the name of Jesus. How can we explain this failure if indeed the author felt that the name of Jesus could function *ex opere operato*?

Now, with respect to the report in Acts 19:13-18, the author also makes it clear that the name of Jesus does not work magically in exorcisms. This is crucial to our understanding of 9:49. Here, the seven sons of Sceva decide to ὀνομάζειν (to name) the name of Jesus, an expression not elsewhere attested to in the NT, and signaling therefore that their operations lay outside normal Christian praxis, and thus outside the Christian faith.⁷⁶⁰ During the attempted exorcism the Sons of Sceva are reported to have said (19:13) during their adjuration “I adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preaches” (‘whom Paul preaches’ finds a partial analog in *PGM* IV, 3019f, which reads, “I invoke you by Jesus, the God of the Hebrews...”),⁷⁶¹ an addition by which the author clearly seeks to show that these men have no share in the Christian community. And the very fact that the entire enterprise was a dismal failure illustrates that the author wrote with the conviction that the name could not be utilized *ex opere operato*.⁷⁶² But there are yet other indications along these lines.

In Acts 8: 9-25, in a narrative which is often overlooked in connection with how the author thought the name of Jesus was used, we see evident concern over establishing just who is authorized to dispense the power of the Spirit. In this narrative Simon the Magician tries to bribe

⁷⁵⁹ John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 524.

⁷⁶⁰ The contexts of Eph. 1:21 and II Tim. 2:19 make clear that these are not really parallels to its use here. Furthermore, one cannot help speculating whether ‘naming’ the name of Jesus does not imply a mechanical use.

⁷⁶¹ Perlewitz notes that the *PGM* expression, “I adjure you by Jesus, the God of the Hebrews,” betrays a non-faith based relationship. In truth then, the similar statement by the Sons of Sceva also demonstrates a non-faith based relationship to Jesus. For Perlewitz comments see, *A Christology of the Book of Acts*, 227.

⁷⁶² So too Nägelsbach, *DNGJHS*, 34, Jacob, *ING*, 52, and Delling, *Die Zueignung*, 51.

Peter (vv. 18 and 19) in order to receive the power of the Spirit. Straightaway Peter curses him and his effort (vv. 20 and 21). Does not the author's view that a non-Christian has no share of the power of God, which is clearly displayed here, speak to the issue of the foreign exorcist? I think that it does and it cements, along with the other observations, that the author viewed only those with some sort of relationship to Jesus as having the ability to access Jesus or God's power.

Going back to my question concerning Lk. 9:49f., it would seem in the light of the above considerations that for Luke at least the foreign exorcist was not using the name of Jesus mechanically. Eino Wilhelms has rightly pointed out that the key to understanding this whole pericope is verse fifty, "For he who is not against us is for us."⁷⁶³ This verse infers that the unknown exorcist was in some fashion on Jesus' side.⁷⁶⁴

Matthew on the other hand seems to understand the matter quite differently. In 7: 22 Jesus states, at the end of his parable on the Tree and the Fruit, that many would come to him in the Last Days and say that they had cast out devils and performed miracles in his name.⁷⁶⁵ Their claim will be made with an eye toward authenticating their relationship to Jesus and hence stake out a share in the world to come. Jesus, however, noting their disobedience (v.23), states that he will disown them. It would appear that in the face of this passage all objections to understanding Matthew as believing in the *ex opere operato* use of the name of Jesus must be thrown out. Clearly, in the author's view those who had not received the truth in repentance *could* use the name of Jesus.

As an aside it is worth mentioning that the Matthean claim that illegitimate people would arise and use the name of Jesus evidently found its fulfillment in later stages of Christianity for

⁷⁶³ Wilhelms, "Der Fremde Exorzist," 163.

⁷⁶⁴ Nägelsbach also sees here a reference to the fact that these exorcists were in some fashion connected to a belief in Jesus. Delling too, comes to a similar conclusion. Ruck-Schröder though thinks that Luke believes that these people were non-Christians. Eitrem also accepts that these exorcists were non-Christians and that Jesus' leniency toward this group can be imputed to his desire to marshal every force in opposition to Satan. For further discussion see *DNGJHS*, 35; *DNGJNT*, 193; *Die Zueignung*, 46; and *Some Notes on the Demonology of the New Testament*, 4.

⁷⁶⁵ Matthew's view of the Last Days is to be contrasted with the Lucan version. The author puts in the mouth of Jesus this statement at Lk. 21:8-9, "See to it that you be not misled; for many will come in My name, saying, 'I am He,' and, 'The time is at hand'; do not go after them. 9 "And when you hear of wars and disturbances, do not be terrified; for these things must take place first, but the end *does not follow* immediately." Never does Luke speak of miracles or exorcisms performed in Jesus' name by 'workers of iniquity' as Matthew does.

Origen records that the name of Jesus was supremely efficacious in exorcising demons, even by those who are 'evil.' In *C. Cels.* (1.6) he states:

Through the influence of some motive unknown to me, Celsus attests that it is by the names of certain demons, and by the use of incantations, that the Christians appear to be possessed of [miraculous] power; hinting I suppose, at the practices of those who expel evil spirits by incantations...For it is not by incantations that the Christians seem to prevail, but *by the name of Jesus* [emphasis mine], accompanied by the announcement of the narratives which relate to him [*historiolae* or *commemoratio eorum*]...*Such power, indeed, does the name of Jesus possess over evil spirits, that there have been incidents where it was effectual, when it was pronounced even by bad men* [emphasis mine]....it is clear that Christians employ no spells, or incantations, *but the simple name of Jesus* [emphasis mine], and certain other words in which they repose faith..."

Returning to the New Testament, we find that there are other places which combine exorcism and the name of Jesus. Here, under the heading of exorcism I place the controversial passage I Cor. 5:1-5. In this text we read of the case where a man had entered into a sexual relationship with his father's wife. In judgment, Paul declares that the man is to be turned over to Satan, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, while the Church is assembled, and when, "the power of the our Lord Jesus is present." I refer this case to the exorcism category insofar as the rite was evidently designed to counter the works of Satan. How does this then relate specifically to exorcism? Actually it forms a sort of anti-exorcism. I shall make this statement clear momentarily, but first, to address our need for a better understanding of I Cor. 5:1-5 I need to answer just what the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι means here, and in its broader connection with the expression, σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ. To gain the measure of this passage it will be necessary to quote the passage in full, and from the Greek:

Ὅλως ἀκούεται ἐν ὑμῖν πορνεία, καὶ τοιαύτη πορνεία ἣτις οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὥστε γυναῖκα τινα τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχειν. ²καὶ ὑμεῖς πεφυσιωμένοι ἐστὲ καὶ οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἐπειθήσατε, ἵνα ἀρθῇ ἐκ μέσου ὑμῶν ὁ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο πράξας; ³ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ, ἀπὸν τῷ σώματι παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἤδη κέκρικα ὡς παρὼν τὸν οὕτως τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον· ⁴ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦ συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, ⁵παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου.

Now the passage can be understood, according to common understanding, in five ways.⁷⁶⁶ The first looks to the term κέκρικα in v.3. Here the connection would yield the meaning, “I have already come to a decision in the name of the Lord Jesus.”⁷⁶⁷ Here the stress is laid upon the legal authority of Paul to make this decision.

The second option is to see ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι relating to κατεργασάμενον. Here the meaning would be that the offending party had carried out his sexual perversion in the name of Jesus. Those who advocate this view use this connection to explain Paul’s uncommonly harsh response. Put differently, if the man had carried out his actions in Jesus’ name then Paul would have just cause in turning him over to Satan. Against this understanding of the passage, Ruck-Schröder has correctly objected that the actions of Paul, much more readily than the actions of the sexual offender, are suitable in the context of the passage in relating to the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι.⁷⁶⁸

The third option relates ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι to συναχθέντων. Of obvious significance here is the sequence of the sentence itself, where συναχθέντων is directly followed by ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι. A further support for this interpretation is the fact that Paul defines the Christian assembly as those who call on the name of the Lord (1 Cor 1:2) and perhaps this is what is meant here.

The fourth possibility is to see ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι as relating to the power of the Lord (σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ). For this interpretation speaks the situation itself, viz. it was an inherently precarious enterprise to turn over to Satan a church member so that the power of the Lord must be present to carry out this operation without undue danger.

The final path is to interpret this passage as relating ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι to παραδοῦναι.⁷⁶⁹ Proponents of this interpretation suggest that the turning over to Satan forms either a sort of

⁷⁶⁶ I mainly follow Ruck-Schröder’s outline here; first because on this question her exposition is clear and lucid, and secondly, because I agree with her conclusions on this particular issue. For her review see, *DNGJNT*, 77-78.

⁷⁶⁷ Ruck-Schröder at this point quotes Orr and Walther. See, *DNGJNT*, 77. Gordon Fee prefers this interpretation too. See Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987), 208.

⁷⁶⁸ Ruck-Schröder, *Ibid.*

⁷⁶⁹ Delling supports this view, as does Heitmüller. See, *Die Zueignung*, 55 fn. 192 and *INJ*, 74, 278.

antithesis to the very rite that inaugurated inclusion into the community, that is baptism, or that it forms a sort of curse, which can be seen as the counterpart to exorcism.⁷⁷⁰ Indeed, just as baptism takes place upon the calling out of the name of Jesus, so here too, the excommunication takes place during the calling out of the name of Jesus.

Now Ruck-Schröder prefers to see the entire process as having taken place in the name of the Lord. The assembling of the Church, Paul's judgment, and most importantly the power and presence of the Jesus, allows for the transfer of the offender over to Satan, and all are carried out by (under or through) the name of Jesus.⁷⁷¹ That παραδοῦναι, συναχθέντων, and σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ might relate to ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι is not too surprising, really. How the statement about Paul's judgment (κέκρικα) relates to ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι however takes a little explaining.

Steyn has noted that when Paul makes his judgment it is very similar to when a magistrate would make a judgment 'in the name of Caesar,' that is, when the Emperor was absent.⁷⁷² This understanding opens the way to understanding how ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι might have related to κέκρικα in this legal-like procedure. In effect, Paul carries out his pronouncement of judgment, "in the name of Jesus," as the authorized representative for Jesus himself. Thus, while ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι would appear to relate readily to παραδοῦναι, συναχθέντων, and σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, κέκρικα cannot necessarily be excluded.

Frankly, I am in sympathy with Rück-Schröder's understanding on this passage, but whatever the disposition of the various possibilities one thing stands clear; the invocation of the name of Jesus unleashes the δύναμις of Jesus in this procedure,⁷⁷³ and insures Jesus'

⁷⁷⁰ Kramer, following Bultmann's lead. See Werner Kramer, *Christos, Kurios, Gottessohn*, 73. Fee begs off this interpretation however and sees only a simple expulsion from the community. See Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 208-209.

⁷⁷¹ Ibid., 78.

⁷⁷² Steyn, "To Onoma tou Kyriou in I Cor.," 486.

⁷⁷³ So too, Conzelmann, although Conzelmann understands the expression, 'turned over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh,' as ultimately signifying death. Surprisingly, no exegete who supports this view, at least to my knowledge, seems to have noticed the possible connection to Acts 5:1-11, where Peter's condemnation of Ananias and Sapphira resulted in death. Was this the same as turning someone over to Satan with a resultant death? Whether such a connection exists I shall leave for others to decide. For Hans Conzelmann's views see, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 117.

presence.⁷⁷⁴

In this case the unleashing of Jesus' power, through his name, brings about the condition indicated earlier. That is, this rite forms the counterpart, of sorts, to exorcism. Expressed differently, this rite is not apotropaic, but seemingly reverses this normal course of action when dealing with dark forces and instead appears to place the offender under Satan's power.

The last passage which I will delve into is Acts 19: 11-18. I have mentioned it a time or two, but there are some aspects of this curious passage which deserve to be tabled in this discussion. First, the claim of the passage that many Christians imported the concept of numinous names from their pagan background can be reasonably assumed, given the narrative in Acts 19:18, where the author claims that so many converts in Ephesus came from magical backgrounds that the burning of their magical texts amounted to 50 thousand drachma. Moreover, verse 17 also supports a belief in numinous names on the part of many, for the passage states that after these events became known to a large number of Jews and Greeks they came to exalt the name of Jesus as a result of hearing of its power. This narrative can be construed as supporting the notion that the name of Jesus was rapidly disseminated in the Greco-Roman magical circles within the first two decades after the death of Jesus. I shall now turn to looking at comparative materials

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

Within the context of exorcisms it is interesting to note that Jesus' name could also be invoked in settings where his power was on display in the face of pagan (or demonic) opposition; that is, the power was used to demonstrate that Jesus is the Lord over the powers of darkness—just as Yahweh's name was used centuries earlier. Loosely speaking, this use of the name of Jesus invites comparison to the use of the name of God by Elijah in his confrontation with the priests of Ba'al on Mt. Carmel. The reader may recall that Elijah made clear that the priests of Ba'al would call upon their god, while he would call upon the name YHWH. The results were that Elijah was vindicated by God's power while the priests of Ba'al were vanquished. This same

⁷⁷⁴ So also Jacob, *ING*, 60 and Heitmüller, *INJ*, 74. Given the *religionsgeschichtliche* background it is more than probable that the invoking of the name of Jesus is meant here as the medium through which the power and presence of Jesus is guaranteed. Interestingly, Aune proposes that I Cor. 5:3-5 is rather analogous to a magical execration. Nägelsbach rather naively believes that the early Christians could not have been susceptible to magical influences for they had been introduced to a new, "göttlichen Faktor." Nägelsbach does raise a more concrete objection to name-magic in the New Testament when he points out that at least as far as the name of Jesus is concerned all of the prayers in the New Testament presume that the answer is still contingent on the request being in accordance with the will of God. For more see *DNGJHS*, 31, 34 and Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity," 1553.

thought of vindication through displays of power is found in Tertullian, where the christological significance of the use of the name of Jesus in exorcisms is crystallized into particularly clear lines in his argumentation. Tertullian, in a most brazen boast to the various Roman provincial governors declares that:

Let a person be brought before your tribunals, who is plainly under demoniacal possession. The wicked spirit, bidden to speak by a follower of Christ, will as readily make the truthful confession that he is a demon, as elsewhere he has falsely asserted that he is a god... Do you say that it is done by magic, or some trick of that sort? You will not say anything of the sort, if you have been allowed the use of your ears and eyes... Why all the authority and power we have over them is from our naming the name of Christ.⁷⁷⁵

As the passage shows, the name of Jesus was being used in a confrontational, winner-take-all contest of power which bears some similarity to the use of the name of YHWH in his confrontation with the priests of Ba'al.

A similar line of argumentation is encountered in Justin's *Dialogue* (30), where Justin maintains that the Christians called Jesus:

Helper and Redeemer, the power of whose name even the demons do fear; and at this day, when they are exorcised in the name of Jesus Christ, crucified under Pontius Pilate, governor of Judaea, they are overcome. And thus *it is manifest to all, that His Father has given Him so great power, by virtue of which demons are subdued to His name* [emphasis mine]...

In like fashion, at *Dialogue* 49, Justin states, "You can perceive that the concealed power of God was in Christ the crucified, before whom demons, and all the principalities and powers of the earth, tremble."

Now the repeated claim that the demons tremble at the very name of Jesus sounds clear echoes to the claims of magicians who pointed toward exorcism as evidence that demons understood the meaning of divine names and trembled before them (e.g. οὐ καὶ οἱ δαίμονες ἀκούοντες τὸ ὄνομα πτοῶνται [PGM XIII.765]). Likewise, it is clear by this rhetoric that Justin intends to demonstrate that the power resident in the name of Jesus, when applied against demons, produced an irrefutable argument that Jesus had been elevated to the supreme position, having been granted dominion and power over every creature and being in the universe.

Utilizing a similar line of argumentation Origen, touching upon the comments made by Celsus about the deification of Antinous, argues that unlike Antinous, who required the

⁷⁷⁵ *Apologeticum* XIII.

intervention of Caesar to install him as a god, Jesus in contradistinction received his commendation by God. The evidence for this assertion, according to Origen (*C. Cels.*

III.XXXVI), was the power resident in the name of Jesus. Origen states:

The Architect of the universe Himself, in keeping with the marvelously persuasive power of His words, commended Him [Jesus] as worthy of honor, not only to those men who were well disposed, but to demons also, and other unseen powers, which even at the present time show that they either fear the name of Jesus as that of a being of superior power, or reverentially accept Him as their legal ruler. For if the commendation had not been given Him by God, the demons would not have withdrawn from those whom they had assailed, in obedience to the mere mention of His name.

Regarding the inception of this practice, in accordance with the New Testament evidence we must reckon with the possibility that at an *extremely* early date groups of exorcists/magicians had already recognized that the name of Jesus seemed to have a remarkable *dynamis*. Moreover, these magicians/exorcists had also discovered (or at least came to believe) that the name of Jesus could be utilized *ex opere operato*. Now, if I have properly traced the lineaments of the inception of the use of the name of Jesus in magic/exorcism, then it can be said that the use of the name of Jesus in non-Christian circles began as early as perhaps the late 40's or early 50's C.E. and that by this time the name of Jesus was already becoming a well-recognized name of power. What might this use suggest christologically?

First, we should note that, seemingly, the name of Jesus was not dependent upon the names of other gods, nor was it subject to any power. The name of Jesus did not need any superfluous rites, exorbitant rituals, or various *nomina barbara* to be effective. Its power was not limited to geographic boundaries, nor restricted to any particular social class. It evidently proceeded, quite unattended, to become one of the most potent numinous name among the hierarchy of magical names. Among Christians of course, no other name possessed so much power as the name of Jesus.

Yet another important christological consideration is that the name of Jesus appears to have been seen by believers as the apotropaic medium *par excellence* in the now dawning *eschatological time of deliverance promised by God*. It is clear from numerous lines of evidence that the early Church, and Judaism, generally believed that they were at or near the end time. In the thinking of the early Church God was now making war (*the eschatological war*) against Satan (e.g., Rev. 12:7-9). In this war Jesus played the seminal and central role. This belief is found in summarized form in I Jn. 3:8, "The Son of God appeared for this purpose, that He might destroy

the works of the devil.” In the light of this eschatological orientation we can embrace Noack’s conclusion that “...die ganze neutestamentliche Dämonologie durch die Eschatologie bestimmt [ist].”⁷⁷⁶ There is yet more to consider when we think in terms of Jesus’ victory over demonic forces, viz. that the entire world and all of mankind, as well as the interrelationship between the two, was conditioned by the influence of demonic forces.⁷⁷⁷ If we add up all of these factors, and recognize the belief in the early Church that Jesus had conquered the demonic realm, then it is fair to say that exorcisms performed in Jesus’ name meant not only liberation for the possessed individual, but also signified a liberation of the world itself. In light of the evidence, *mutatis mutandis*, we may assert that the name of Jesus was now among the premier *effugator daemonum* of the Hellenistic world. What might this observation mean in terms of christology?

We have seen how the name of Jesus was used in a fashion similar to what we have observed to in the *PGM*. Thus, we can surmise that the name of Jesus must have been viewed as having the authority and power reserved for the highest god.⁷⁷⁸ Seen in these terms, one can say that the exclusive use of the name of Jesus by Gentile converts indicates that they were convinced that Jesus’ name was now *the* name of power; a name simply unparalleled in its numinous and apotropaic potency. But did this use intimate that they thought that Jesus was divine?

This question is frankly not easy to answer. Invoking the name of Jesus to repeal evil forces is not, per se, a proof that they viewed Jesus as a deity. We must remember that Greco-Roman magicians also invoked angels (= *paredroi*), so simply invoking Jesus’ name is not warrant enough to justify a positive conclusion. What does, however, suggest that Gentile Christians viewed Jesus as a deity is the *exclusive use* of the name of Jesus. I have just mentioned that the natural tendency in these situations was to invoke the name of the *Demiurge*, or the *Pantocrator*. By invoking exclusively the name of Jesus, these early Gentile Christians

⁷⁷⁶ As Bent Noack notes in his *Satanás und Sotería*, 114.

⁷⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 125.

⁷⁷⁸ Todd E. Klutz, “The Grammar of Exorcism in the Ancient Mediterranean World: Some Cosmological, Semantic, and Pragmatic Reflections on How Exorcistic Prowess Contributed to the Worship of Jesus,” in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Eds. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999), 160. Klutz refers here to Jesus himself, and the conclusion which others must have drawn based on his exorcistic powers was that Jesus was a divine being. But, if Jesus appeared to have divine power over the spiritual realm, then perforce so it must have appeared the same with his name given its evident use in casting out demons.

testify to the fact that they see Jesus as being at the top of the divine hierarchy. If we then remember that Gentiles viewed numerous 'inferior' spiritual beings as being deities, the very fact that Gentile converts used the name of Jesus bears witness to the conclusion that Jesus was seen as the ultimate power-thus we can infer that they thought the exalted Jesus was a deity of some sort.

Now within a Jewish-Christian context, the use of the name of Jesus, instead of Yahweh's name, seems all the more notable when one considers just how high an opinion the Jews had of exorcism as a tool against demonic forces. It seems to me that we can say that exorcism was probably held in the most exalted status for the Jew in terms of a demonstration of the power of God over Satan. In this light the use of the name of Jesus in exorcisms stands out all the more as a remarkable change over from the pre-Christian period.

Now the simple fact that Jewish-Christians invoked the name of Jesus is not a proof that Jesus was thought to be divine. We should recall at this point that the name of Solomon was thought to be apotropaic and it was at times also invoked. We need something more decisive if we are to believe that the invocation of Jesus' name implies that he was viewed as divine.

What does speak in favor of seeing in this use an implicit belief in the divinity of Jesus is that Jesus' name was used as a 'stand alone' apotropaic agent. Nowhere, as far as I am aware, is the name of Solomon used alone. It seems to have been used in conjunction with the name of YHWH. In the case of the *DSS* documents, for example, we saw that the same section which implied that Solomon's name was used in exorcisms, we find also that the name of YHWH was invoked (*11Q11 col. III.1-4*).

Similarly, in the *lamella* that I cited in the Greco-Roman magic section,⁷⁷⁹ we saw that it bore a crude drawing of the Seal of Solomon, which was however encircled by the Tetragrammaton. The fact that the *lamella* has both the name of Solomon and the Tetragrammaton implies that perhaps Jews did not consider Solomon's name alone to be powerful enough to overcome every demon. If this supposition is true, then the exclusive use of the name of Jesus would imply that Jesus was thought of as all-powerful. This, I suggest, strongly hints that the earliest Jewish-Christians thought of Jesus as divine.

⁷⁷⁹ For further details concerning the *lamella* see Kotansky, "Greek Exorcistic Amulets," 267-8.

HEALING IN THE NAME OF JESUS

The claim that the name of Jesus could effect healing is as old as the events said to have occurred after Pentecost, or so we are told in the Book of Acts, and this formed a strand of tradition so vigorous that it left its traces even outside Christian circles.⁷⁸⁰ When we turn to the Book of Acts we read of several accounts of healings which were accompanied by the pronouncement of the name of Jesus.⁷⁸¹ For example, in Acts 3:1ff. we read of the healing of the lame man, purportedly through the name of Jesus. This passage opens a section in Acts that extends from 3: 6 until 5: 40: a section where the name of Jesus plays a foundational role. Acts 3:6, 13, for example, speaks of healing in the name of Jesus, Acts 3:16 deals with the relationship between of faith and the name of Jesus, Acts 4: 10, 30 takes up the theme of the name of Jesus and its healing power, 4:12 again points to the central place of the name of Jesus as the sole name which all must call upon so that they might be saved; and, finally, 5:40-41, deals with the theme of suffering for the sake of the name of Jesus. Returning to 3:16, we can discern from the narrative that although the name clearly functions as a source of power (v. 16c), it can evidently be rendered serviceable only when faith is present (v. 16a).⁷⁸²

⁷⁸⁰ Jewish attestation to this belief include *T. Hullin* 1.22f. (cf. *J. Shabbat* XIV.4; *J' Avodah Zarah* II.2 (40d); *B. 'Avodah Zarah* 27b), while in Greco-Roman circles the comments of Celsus are relevant. And of course, as we have seen earlier, the name of Jesus is exemplified as a numinous name in the *PGM*. As for Celsus' views, see *C. Cels.* VI.

⁷⁸¹ Interestingly, the compound name 'Lord Jesus (Christ)' is never used, even though it is found in statements involving baptism (8:16).

⁷⁸² Nägelsbach takes Acts 3:16 as signifying that the power seen in this passage is contained in the Gospel itself, because it has the power to spark faith in Jesus and his name. That the Gospel has power is also seen in Rom. 1:16. I, however, believe that Paul's own testimony in I Corinthians 1:18-25 necessitates that we recognize that the Gospel was a scandal for the Jew and foolishness to the Greek. Accordingly, demonstrations of power were needed to stir faith (e.g., I Cor. 2:4-5; I. Thess 1:4; Jn. 10:38). Delling, basing his judgment on a reading of the account of Acts chapter 4 (in which Peter recounts this healing), notes that the name of Jesus and Jesus interchange readily. This means, in his opinion, that no thought of *Namenglaubens* is conceived of here. In my opinion, however, he fails to appreciate the curious fact that the narrative is couched in terms whereby the name of Jesus plays the central lead. Naturally, the name of Jesus does signify the recognition that it is Jesus who is the crucified and resurrected One (4:12), but more stands behind this use of the name. Still, Delling sees 4:30, where Peter petitions God to perform miracles and wonders in the name of Jesus, as supporting his view that the name represents only a reference to Jesus and his works. On this showing, however, it seems difficult to explain why the Apostles could not just as readily have said to the lame man, "I offer healing by the power and authority invested in me," or "By the power of which the Lord Jesus has," rather than invoking the name of Jesus. In any case, for Delling's views see, *Die Zueignung*, 49, and for Nägelsbach's views see, *DNGJHS*, 59.

With respect to this extraordinary section Ruck-Schröder has noted five facets of the use of the name of Jesus which seem to be a point of emphasis. Two are of particular interest for my study: first, the relationship between name and faith (3:16);⁷⁸³ and second, the relationship between name, power, and the bestowal of the Spirit (4:7,10).⁷⁸⁴ These two aspects together serve to underscore the connection between the name of Jesus and its link to two indispensable components for the acceptance of the Gospel: faith and the action of the Spirit. Another role which the power of the name of Jesus played is that it also served notice to both Israel, and her authorities (4: 7-12), that Jesus had indeed been justified and glorified by God. This power served to testify to the glorification of Jesus before unbelievers in much the same way that christophanies, and resurrection appearances, bore witness to the Apostles.

Now, one sees that the power which resides in the name of Jesus is of a type that hitherto had only been thought to reside in God's name. This exhibition of the power serves to illustrate that Jesus has not only been vindicated by God, but also glorified and exalted to an unprecedented level-literally to the level of co-regent. This theologoumenon is highlighted even further within the narrative at Acts 3: 1-10; that is, by the placement of the healing within the Temple area. As we already know from our examination of the Old Testament Deuteronomist materials, the Temple was the place where God's Name resided and it was where the High Priest spoke out the divine name during Yom Kippur. Just as significantly, the Temple was believed to stand at the center of God's future salvific actions.⁷⁸⁵ With this backdrop in mind, the fact that it was now *Jesus'* name which effected the healing must surely have been understood to imply that a profound realignment had taken place in the divine economy.⁷⁸⁶

Perhaps this implied realignment helps to explain why one of the primary objectives of the Sanhedrin was to stamp out any naming of the name in various activities (cf. 4:17ff.; 5:28,40).⁷⁸⁷ If this is true, then no doubt this action was based upon their alarm that the naming

⁷⁸³ Ruck-Schröder believes that the name itself produces this faith. See *DNGJNT*, 185-186.

⁷⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 183.

⁷⁸⁵ Lars Hartman, *Auf den Namen des Herrn*, 37.

⁷⁸⁶ Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 184.

⁷⁸⁷ Perlewitz conjectures, rightly in my view, that the prohibition was occasioned by the desire to prohibit the Apostles from displays of power performed in Jesus' name. That the Sanhedrin was concerned to prohibit the use of name of Jesus in displays of power can be seen in their initial question in 4:7. They ask, ἐν ποίᾳ δυνάμει ἢ

of the name of Jesus brought about miracles, which in turn helped to fuel early Christian conversion because it inculcated faith. With these considerations in hand it might be helpful to examine if the author of Acts viewed the name of Jesus in a magical sense, or at least as a sort of *Machtmittel*.

Many exegetes have maintained that there is not even the slightest vestige of a *Namensglauben* in Acts. I find this position untenable. While it is true that the author does not view the name of Jesus as being capable of magical manipulation, he does certainly think of the name as a *Machtmittel* which can be put into operation with faith. The following points will establish the soundness of this conclusion.

First of all, any notion that the author did not have magical inclinations is incorrect. We see many indications that the author is not at all bashful about including magical thinking in his work. For example, the author states in 5:15 that Peter's shadow was believed by the crowds to have numinous power. It is also clear from v. 16 that the author believed that Peter's shadow could heal.⁷⁸⁸ In 19:11-12, we read that Paul did extraordinary miracles, so much so that even handkerchiefs and aprons that had touched Paul could, when brought to the ill, effected a miraculous cure. In a similar vein, the author also reports that the Spirit was bestowed after an apostle laid hands upon a believer (e.g., Acts 8: 17; 19:6). In all of these cases we observe that the medium in question required some contact with either Peter or Paul. Now we must ask ourselves why there was a need to make contact to bring about healing? Certainly, these cases appear to be direct instances of so-called 'contact' magic. In any case, at no point in any of these narratives does the author signal that he rejects out of hand any of these beliefs.

ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο ὑμεῖς? The use of *dynamis*, alongside of *onoma*, signal clearly that they saw the apostles miraculous actions as drawing upon a numinous source, probably a numinous name. On another tack, Delling correctly observes that the prohibition was not only directed against the utilization of the name of Jesus, but also against, "die Berufung auf den Aussagenkomplex, der sich an den Namen Jesus hängt." See Perlewitz, *A Christology of the Book of Acts*, 153. For Delling's views see, *Die Zueignung*, 48.

⁷⁸⁸ So also P.W. van der Horst, "Peter's Shadow. The religio-historical background of Acts V.15," *NTS* 23: 205. Although of no direct relevance to this passage, it is nevertheless interesting that surrogate baptism (i.e. for the dead), which the Corinthians practiced (1 Cor. 15:29), was also reflective of a magical conception of the rite. Also, it is worth calling attention to the opinion of Kotansky, who notes that the use of clothes to heal the sick in Acts were utilized in a fashion completely in keeping with that of magical amulets. See Kotansky, "Greek Exorcistic Amulets," 245. See Gerhard Barth, "Taufe auf den Namen Jesu. Kurzbericht über den Stand neutestamentlicher Arbeiten zum Verständnis der Taufe im Urchristentum," in *Neutestamentliche Versuche und Beobachtungen*, (Waltrop Germany: Hartmut Spenner, 1996), 56-57.

Another buttress for my conclusion is found at Acts 3:16, where Peter explains to the onlookers just how the crippled beggar at the Temple had been healed, “It is Jesus’ name and the faith that comes through *it* that has given this complete healing to him [emphasis mine].” It is a curious fact indeed that the author includes both faith *and* the name of Jesus, if he held the conviction that faith alone brought about miraculous cures.⁷⁸⁹

Furthermore, in the immediate aftermath of Pentecost the author relates that when all the believers came together to pray to God for the continued success of the fledgling movement Peter prayed to God (4: 30), “Stretch out your hand to heal and perform miraculous signs and wonders through the name of your holy servant Jesus.” Once again we see the pattern where the name of Jesus surfaces in contexts where wonders and miracles are related. This passage, in my view, suggests that God’s power was seen as operational within Jesus’ name (note too the *διά* preposition).⁷⁹⁰

Moreover, there appear to be further indications within the work that suggest that the author viewed the name as a *Machtmittel*. What I am referring to here is the habitual use of the prepositional phrase *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* whenever a work of power is performed (e.g., 3:6; 4:10; 16:18), in contrast to other activities which are not power related, such as speaking or teaching in the name of Jesus, where the author usually employs the preposition *ἐπί* (e.g., 4:17, 18; 5:28, 40).⁷⁹¹

Now this arrangement of prepositions must be seen in light of the fact that the later half of Acts, and the opening chapter of the Gospel of Luke, make perfectly clear to the reader that the author is quite at home with the Greek language. Given this, it is quite curious indeed to

⁷⁸⁹ C.K. Barrett has offered the clever suggestion that Luke added the phrase, with its combination of faith and name, to his source in order to combat any thought of name-magic. See, C. K. Barrett, “Faith and Eschatology in Acts 3,” in *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für W.G. Kümmel*, ed. Erich Grässer and O. Merk, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985), 4-8.

⁷⁹⁰ Delling, taking his cue from the portion of this text which speaks of God stretching forth His hands to act, rejects any hint of *Namenglauben*. This stance overlooks that fact that these are not mutually exclusive positions. One can believe that God has imbued Jesus’ name with *dynamis*, yet still feel the need to ask God for His continuing involvement and help. For Delling’s views see, *Die Zueignung*, 50.

⁷⁹¹ Delling acknowledges this grouping of prepositions but is unsure of any instrumental meaning based on 4:12. This overlooks the possibility that the author was purposely recounting what he said for the purposes of emphasizing the source of the healing power, in distinction from simply making reference to the name as the basis for the action. After all, Delling does acknowledge that expression, when used with *ἐπί*, is best translated as, “auf Grund dieses Namen.” This allows us to see an instrumental use for *ἐν*. Delling also recognizes that the author does appear to be consciously choosing his prepositions (or at least one can discern a pattern). For Delling’s view see, *Die Zueignung*, 48, 51-52.

observe that when the crippled beggar is healed in chapter 3, the exact words which Peter speaks are ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, yet when referring to other activities outside of the miraculous he employs the proposition ἐπί. Now it is at once obvious that ἐπί makes perfect sense in these other passages, conveying the meaning that these activities are done with reference to Jesus' name; that is, they are done with reference to Jesus himself. Now the author's familiarity with the Greek language and his proper use of the proposition ἐπί implies then that we should make the same allowance for some purpose in his use of ἐν when relating accounts of miraculous deeds. The meaning would be clear: the use of ἐν by the author signifies an instrumental use, and thus, that the name of Jesus was seen as the medium which brought about these miracles.⁷⁹²

One final indication that the author held to some sort of *Namenglaubens* is found in the account of the mission of the Seventy (or 72), which stems from the Lucan *Sondergut*. Here we find at the end of the mission the statement that (Lk. 10:17), "The seventy returned with joy, saying, 'Lord, even the demons are subject to us *in Your name* [emphasis mine].'" This sending of the disciples stands in contrast to that of Mk. 3:14-15, where we read, "And He [Jesus] appointed twelve, that they might be with Him, and that He might send them out to preach, and to have authority to cast out the demons." Here there is no mention of the use of Jesus' name, yet in a broadly similar sending of the disciples in Luke's Gospel (or his source) he adds his understanding of the means for this exorcistic success. It is the power of the name of Jesus which subdues demons. This difference between Mark and Luke signals that the latter author was very conscious of the power of Jesus' name and sought to emphasize this fact. Still, all of the various texts that I have covered never really answer the question of whether the author viewed the name of Jesus as something more than just a *Machtmittel*. That is, could it be used in a magical fashion? I shall turn to this question now.

Against this backdrop it is evident that invoking Jesus' name in healing has evident points of contact with magic, albeit in this case in a negative sense. Susan Garrett, for example, has demonstrated that one of the primary agendas that the author pushes is that the power of the

⁷⁹² Although Ziesler does not use my line of argumentation, he too sees the healings in the name of Jesus as taking place with the power which seems to reside in the name. See J.A. Ziesler, "The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles," 33-34.

Apostles is superior to magic.⁷⁹³ It is as if the author means to say, “You think that divine names have power? Indeed, but the divine name with the real power is ‘*Jesus*’.” Garrett, although not specifically arguing this point, says of Luke’s intentions, “...in Luke’s narrative world (if not in his social world), the opinion that Jesus’ name is like all the other names used in magic will not be allowed for long.”⁷⁹⁴

Although Garrett’s view is correct, so far as it goes, I must, at the risk of being accused of putting too fine a point on it, contend that we must differentiate between a magical view of the name (that is, it could be used to control the bearer of the name), and strictly speaking, *Namenglauben*. By the latter I mean the belief that divine names were numinous and apotropaic. As I have already just mentioned, it would appear that the author intends to demonstrate that this is indeed the case, except that Jesus’ name was at the top of the pecking order. Instead of trying to dispel any notions of belief in numinous and apotropaic names, the author appears to be saying that one such name does qualify in this regard, the ‘true’ numinous and apotropaic name ‘Jesus.’

Now name-magic, as I define it for the purposes of this work, involves in part the belief that a numinous name could be used mechanically, by any and all as it were. Simple invocation of the name could compel the divinity to perform the demand of the invoker. By this criterion, the author clearly rejects a magical *use* of the name, but *not* per se its numinous nature.⁷⁹⁵ I think then that one must conclude that the author did adhere to a type of *Namenglauben*.⁷⁹⁶

⁷⁹³ Susan Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil. Magic and the Demonic in Luke’s Writings* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1989). This is most amply demonstrated in the response of the Ephesians to the events surrounding the thrashing of the Sons of Sceva in Acts 19: 13-16. When these events became known all those who had taken up magic were disposed to burn their magical books (19: 17-20) and thereafter, “the name of Jesus was held in high honor (19: 17).” This narrative would strongly suggest that the author desires to impress upon his readers that Jesus’ name was the ‘true’ numinous name, superior to all other magical names.

⁷⁹⁴ Garrett, *Demise*, 93.

⁷⁹⁵ That the author of Acts did not himself understand the name of Jesus as a *magical* medium (i.e., a medium that can be used magically) can be seen from Acts 9:34, where Peter says to the lame Aeneas, “Jesus Christ heals you; arise, and make your bed.” This passage declares that Jesus is not only alive, but that he is present (or at least active) at the moment of the healing. Thus, although others could view the name of Jesus as operating in a magical fashion, the author clearly thinks that the resurrected Jesus is the present source of healing power which resides in the name. Indeed, the use of the name of Jesus in this healing can be understood as an invocation of Jesus, so that he would come and heal the person. Thus, name=presence in this case. Other New Testament authors paint a similar picture.

⁷⁹⁶ For his part, Delling rejects any *Namenglauben*. He notes that Jesus appears interchangeably with his name in the narrative, and this establishes for Delling that the name is nothing more than a symbol for Jesus. This

As a comparative, let us look at the case of Paul, who clearly believes that his apostolate was substantiated by his ability to perform miracles such as healing (I. Cor. 2:1-4; II Cor. 12:12), yet at the same time he contends that faith is needed to bring about the effect (Gal. 3:5).⁷⁹⁷

Now, let us look at a related context, James 5: 14-15, where the author mentions that when a sick person is brought into the assembly the person was to be anointed with oil in the name of Jesus, with an accompanying prayer of faith. Before I investigate the passage further I need to establish whether the 'Lord' is Jesus or God.

With respect to just who the 'Lord' is, scholarship is divided. Davids, for example, thinks the word means God,⁷⁹⁸ while Dibelius inclines toward seeing Jesus as the referent.⁷⁹⁹ Unfortunately, when we turn to the textual apparatus for this verse we find no simple answers.⁸⁰⁰ In order to come to any conclusion we shall have to depend on other criteria, and in this case only the broader context, and perhaps authorial habit, offer us any assistance.

If we look at the statistics for this chapter, James utilizes **Κυρίος** some nine times. Of those, 2 refer unambiguously to Jesus (5: 7-8), while four refer to God (5:4; 10-11: admittedly, in 5: 11, the author may have meant 'Jesus'). This leaves two unresolved places; both in verses 14 and 15. One solution is simply to recognize that this interchangeability between Jesus and God in terms of the application of *kyrios* raises the possibility that the author had so incorporated Jesus into the divine identity that the word 'Lord' was used comfortably for both God and Jesus; that is, they are 'united'-and this by a possible Jewish-Christian. Still, at the end of the day, it must be

overlooks though what the comparative material suggests; namely, that people of that time often viewed the name of the person as being somehow imbued with the power and authority of the person. Thus, the simple switch back and forth is just as readily explicable on grounds of a mystical view of the name (but not a magical one). For Delling's views see *Die Zueignung*, 49.

⁷⁹⁷ Delling correctly notes that there is not even a hint of name-magic in Paul's writings. See *Die Zueignung*, 72.

⁷⁹⁸ Peter H. Davids, *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, The New Testament Greek Testament Commentary, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, , 1982), 193. Davids, who has acknowledged that Jesus' name was called out in healing acts, nonetheless sees ἐγρεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος as referring to God.

⁷⁹⁹ Martin Dibelius, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, trans. Michael A. Williams, ed. Helmut Koester, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976; originally *Der Brief des Jakobus*, 11th rev. ed, Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 253.

⁸⁰⁰ The majority of the witnesses read, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου, and as Dibelius observes, later witnesses which incorporate the addition, τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (with or without Χριστοῦ), are worthless in helping us decide this problem. For more by Dibelius see, *James*, 253 fn. 67.

admitted that we have no sound method for concluding decisively whether Jesus or God is meant in 5: 14-15 when we examine authorial habits. It seems to me, that our only path is to consult the comparable New Testament background material concerning healing.

• When we look to background material on healing, as we have already seen, it is the name of Jesus which is used in healing and not God's. In fact, I am unaware of any early Christian text (ca. 150 C.E. and earlier) that uses the word **Κυρίος** when referring to healing in a manner that would suggest that God is meant. Following the pattern imposed by this data we are left with Jesus as our only tenable option.⁸⁰¹ So, I accept that Jesus' name is meant at 5:14-15. Having addressed this, let us look at the passage itself.

Now certainly, this passage is pivotal in gaining insight into how the name of Jesus functioned in the early Church and accordingly I need to quote the passage in full:

Is anyone among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; 15 and the prayer offered in faith will restore the one who is sick, and the Lord will raise him up, and if he has committed sins, they will be forgiven him.

Right away several unusual features leap out. First, in stark contrast to the charismatic gifts of individuals found in I Cor. 12:7, here we read of an eschatological exhibition of power in the service of a particular congregational office.⁸⁰² Who these elders were is a question for another time; what matters is that they employed the name of Jesus and the fact that evidently their office required them to mediate healing. Also of interest is the use of oil. Oil, in the ancient world commanded an unusual respect in healing, and its use is widely attested.⁸⁰³ As for the question of the nature of the rite and its significance, I shall turn to that now.

In order to answer just what this rite signified we need only remember that in the ancient world sickness was all too often seen as an outgrowth of the action of demons. Seen in this light

⁸⁰¹ Several other features point to the fact that the name of Jesus is meant rather than God's. First, at James 2:7, the Name which is called out over the assembly is Jesus. Secondly, Acts 3:16 strongly intimates that the prayer of faith comes either through Jesus, or through his name (contingent on how one interprets this awkward passage). Third, the phrase expressly states that the name which is to be invoked is the name of the Lord. The *kyrios* title had of course already been transferred to Jesus. Furthermore, Ruck-Schröder points out that any healing of a sick person would naturally presuppose that Jesus' name would be called out. See Ruck-Schröder, *DNG.INT*, 235-236.

⁸⁰² Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 194.

⁸⁰³ Isa. 1:6; Jer. 8:22; Mk. 6:13; Lk. 10:34; Josephus *AJ* 17.172; *BJ* 1.657; *Life Adam* 36; *Apoc. Mos.* 9:3; *Sl. Enoch* 22:8-9; Philo *Som.* 2.58; Plato *Menex.* 238; Pliny *HN* 23.39-40; Galen 2.10. I borrow here from the list drawn up by Davids. See, *The Epistle of James*, 193.

we must reckon that the rite was exorcistic in nature.⁸⁰⁴ Thus, healing in Jesus' name signified that Jesus was now Lord over the spirit realm. Finally, we come to two last questions: first, what does the name of Jesus seem to represent in this passage (i.e., what function does it play); and second, does the Name produce physical healing as an outgrowth of the salvation which Jesus brought about?

First, it should be noted that the name functions both as an appeal to Jesus,⁸⁰⁵ as well as being the source of the healing power which resides in his name.⁸⁰⁶ It was also meant to insure both the blessing and the presence of Jesus for the successful completion of the healing, and as such it was required that the name of Jesus be spoken during the anointing.

Beyond these considerations there are also weighty theological reasons for believing that the name of Jesus was thought by the author to be endowed with real δύναμις. The question here is whether the name of Jesus should be anticipated to have healing power given that it was his name alone that was given to mankind for salvation. I think that any reflection on the nature of salvation suggests that physical salvation (i.e., healing) must be included in the greater scheme of things. Pesch has correctly observed in this regard, when he considered the case of the healing of the lame man in the Temple in Acts 3, that physical salvation is bound with spiritual salvation.

⁸⁰⁴ Pace Davids, correctly M. Dibelius. Davids explains this verse in terms of "an opening to the power of God for him to intervene..." Dibelius, following the right trail in my judgment, perceives that the rite was apotropaic in nature, while Böcher states that "Da auch Jesus und seine Apostel in den Krankheiten das Werk schädlicher Dämonen sehen, kann Heilung nur die Vertreibung dieser Dämonen bedeuten." Regarding examples I shall cite three. Origen quotes Celsus to the effect that (*C. Cel.* VIII. LVIII), "Let any one inquire of the Egyptians, and he will find that everything, even the most insignificant, is committed to the care of a certain demon. The body of man is divided into thirty-six parts, and as many demons of the air are appointed to the care of it, each having charge of a different part, although others make the number much larger. All these demons have in the language of that country distinct names; as Chnoumen, Chnachoumen..., and other Egyptian names. Moreover, they call upon them [names], and are cured of diseases of particular parts of the body." Other examples include 1QapGen xx 26, where the affliction in question is described as "a spirit of purulence." And finally, 4QD^b 9i 5-13, where we find a catalog of minor skin diseases which have as their source various demons. In this context see also Mt. 9:32f. and 12:22. For Böcher's work see Otto Böcher, *Christus Exorcista: Dämonismus und Taufe im Neuen Testament*, (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1972), 77. For Davids' views see, *The Epistle of James*, 194. For Dibelius see, *James*, 252.

⁸⁰⁵ Delling allows only that this intends to be taken as an action which is carried out under reference to Jesus. I think that more is implied. I believe that it also involves the belief that by invoking the name of Jesus during the anointing the presence of Jesus would be insured. It also signifies, as I just mentioned above, that Jesus' name was seen as a source of power for those who belong to the community. For Delling see, *Die Zueignung*, 44.

⁸⁰⁶ Ruck-Schröder formulates the relationship between the name of Jesus and God in 5: 15 as follows: "Diese an Gebet und Krankensalbung geknüpte Heilszuversicht auf das Handeln Gottes hinzielt... Die Kraft Jesu, die in seinem Namen vergegenwärtigt wird, ist der heilenden und sündenvergebenden Kraft Gottes..." Ruck-Schröder views see *DNJGNT*, 237.

He comments, “Die >> Rettung<< (vgl. 2,21.40.47), die an die Anrufung dieses Namens gebunden ist, umfaßt auch da leibliche Heil.”⁸⁰⁷ The name of Jesus is not only a symbol for Jesus, or a representation of the Gospel. Rather, just as the name of Jesus opens the door to salvation, so too was it endowed with the δύναμις to bring about physical healing.⁸⁰⁸ In effect, these two qualities are bound together, part and parcel of the same physical reality. It is unjustified therefore to separate these functions and see one as symbolic and the other as real. In point of fact, it is precisely because people could see that the name of Jesus possessed power that the opportunity was then provided to proclaim the Kerygma.⁸⁰⁹ It is in *this* sense, as I have written earlier, that Acts 3:16 is to be understood when the author writes, ‘It is Jesus’ name and the faith that comes through *it*.’⁸¹⁰ The evidence suggests the possibility that the author of James understood the case to be one where faith came through the name of Jesus when a miracle transpired after Jesus’ name was invoked.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

Accepting as an established dictum that the name of Jesus was a medium of healing we must now ask ourselves what the significance was of this function. To begin, we need to

⁸⁰⁷ Rudolf Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, EKK evang.-kath. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Ed. Josef Blank, in connection with Otto Böcher (Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1986), 140.

⁸⁰⁸ The connection between physical healing and salvation is at its most visible in Peter’s speech before the Elders of Israel in Acts 4: 10-12. Peter connects the dots for us when his speech ends with the following statement, “...let it be known to all of you, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ the Nazarene, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead-by *this name this man stands here before you in good health*. 11 “He is the stone which was rejected by you, the builders, *but* which became the very corner stone. 12 “And there is salvation in no one else; *for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men, by which we must be saved* [emphasis mine].” Here we see healing and salvation tied to the name of Jesus.

⁸⁰⁹ Pesch indicates this too in his treatment of Acts 4:30, where the Apostles ask God to perform miracles in the name of Jesus. See Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 178. Ruck-Schröder, when examining Acts 8:12, 16 comes tantalizingly close to a similar conclusion when she states the following: “Die Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes und die wunderwirkende Kraft Jesu, die in seinem Namen present ist [emphasis Ruck-Schröder’s], gehören im Wirken der Apostel zusammen.” See *DNGJNT*, 173.

⁸¹⁰ Admittedly the Greek here, ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ πίστις ἦ δι’ αὐτοῦ, is awkward. This has led to two camps when it comes to translation. The first prefers to translate αὐτοῦ, as him, and this is reflected in several bible translations. The more natural, and in the context the more obvious translation is to take αὐτοῦ as referring back to τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. It is also in keeping with Peter’s comments before the Sanhedrin in Acts 4:10 when he claims that it was Jesus’ name that accomplished the healing. Commentators such as Haenchen accept this and also think that the name itself produces faith. See Ernst Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 5th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 167-168. I should also point out that Ruck-Schröder also takes αὐτοῦ as referring to ‘name’ and not to Jesus, and she also takes this verse as indicating that the name itself produced faith. Certainly, if Jesus’ name is a salvific name, than we might expect that it had the power to create faith to believe for a healing. See her comments in *DNGJNT*, 185-186.

remember that within Judaism YHWH is the one who grants life (Amos 5:4f.). Indeed, it is YHWH who, “kills and makes alive; He brings down to Sheol and raises up” (I Sam. 2:6). Isaiah (45: 6-7) even declares:

I am the LORD, and there is no other, 7 The One forming light and creating darkness,
Causing well-being and creating calamity; I am the LORD who does all these.

The reader may recall that this section of Isaiah comes from the trial speeches of Isaiah, where God makes His most strident affirmation of His sole claim to divinity. Nestled as it is in this monotheistic section, the claim that God causes healing is really a sign of the sovereign rule of God in the affairs of the cosmos. Not only is this so, but other passages also emphasize that healing belongs to God and that it is bound up with obedience to the Mosaic covenant. In Ex. 28: 58-59 for example we find the following statement:

If you are not careful to observe all the words of this law which are written in this book, to fear this honored and awesome name, the LORD your God, 59 then the LORD will bring extraordinary plagues on you and your descendants, even severe and lasting plagues, and miserable and chronic sicknesses.

The Old Testament emphasizes yet again that YHWH is the one who heals His people as Ex. 15:26 illustrates, “ ...I will put none of the diseases on you which I have put on the Egyptians; for I, the LORD, am your healer.” (ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι κύριος ὁ ἰώμενός σε LXX). A similar promise is attached to the conquest of Canaan where YHWH promises to those who are faithful (Ex. 23:25), “You shall serve the LORD your God, and He will bless your bread and your water; and I will remove sickness from your midst.”

The Old Testament also makes clear that Israelites were expected to seek God for healing as the narrative concerning the diseased feet of King Asa shows (II Chron. 16:12), “And in the thirty-ninth year of his reign Asa became diseased in his feet. His disease was severe, yet even in his disease he did not seek the LORD, but the physicians.” This same belief is again seen in Isa. 38:1-5. Here Hezekiah had fallen ill and immediately he turns to God who then heals him. The passage reads:

In those days Hezekiah became mortally ill. And Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz came to him and said to him, “Thus says the LORD, ‘Set your house in order, for you shall die and not live.’” 2 Then Hezekiah turned his face to the wall, and prayed to the LORD, 3 and said, “Remember now, O LORD, I beseech Thee, how I have walked before Thee in truth and with a whole heart, and have done what is good in Thy sight.” And Hezekiah wept bitterly. 4 Then the word of the LORD came to Isaiah, saying, 5 “Go and say to Hezekiah, ‘Thus says the

LORD, the God of your father David, "I have heard your prayer, I have seen your tears; behold, I will add fifteen years to your life.

In fact, within the Old Testament almost every place where the verb *rāpā* (to heal) occurs it is YHWH who is the subject of the action.⁸¹¹ This nearly sole restriction to YHWH serves to underscore the fact that within Jewish piety, as it is expressed in the Old Testament, it was YHWH who was conceived of as the sole source of healing power. Of further importance is the fact that in an eschatological perspective God had promised to bring healing to His people (e.g., Isa. 29:18; 30: 26; 35:5).

Now as a practical matter, we have seen in the section on healing in the name of God that Elijah evidently performed healings by invoking God through His name. This is made clear in the narrative concerning the raising of the widow's son (I Kings 17:20-22). In the narrative it is said that Elijah, ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν κύριον. Also, healing in God's name is strongly hinted at in the situation of the healing of Naaman the leper (II Kings 5:1-14). We should recall that the prophet Elisha instructs Naaman to go and wash himself in the River Jordan seven times. Naaman then angrily responds (v. 11) that, "I thought [that], He will surely come out to me, and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, and wave his hand over the place, and cure the leper."

This same belief in the healing power of God's name is hinted at in II Kings 1:1-17, where Ahaziah had suffered a grievous injury and then sought a miraculous cure. Ahaziah sent messengers to consult the god of Ekron (i.e., Baal-Zebub). According to the narrative YHWH sends His angel to Elijah and commands that Elijah confront the delegation from Ahaziah and state:

'Is it because there is no God in Israel that you are going off to consult Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron?' ⁴ Therefore this is what the LORD says: 'You will not leave the bed you are lying on. You will certainly die!'

These narratives strongly suggest that in matters of healing the devout Jew felt that he/she could rely upon the invocation of YHWH to bring about a cure. No doubt in many cases this was the sole option, for little competent medical help could be expected.

With these facts in mind it is rather amazing to see, as an indication of just how thoroughly the early Church had adopted a binitarian view of the divine reality, that they could

⁸¹¹ See Herbert Von Niehr, "JHWH als Arzt. Herkunft und Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gottesprädikation," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 35,1 (1991): 3.

effortlessly refer to miracles done by the apostles as being both the result of God (Acts 15:12) and Jesus (Acts 14:3). It is also of significance that the Old Testament ascribes to the eschatological age the healing of diseases (Is. 35:5); a promise that the early Church had christologically reformulated to mean that Jesus' advent was the beginning of the promised eschatological era, replete with healing for those who call upon the name of Jesus.

In this new age Jesus' name was now the name that brought about healing, as well as mediating salvation. Practically speaking, in ritual, Jesus' name now functioned as God's name had functioned previously. In the mind of the earliest Christians, God mandated this changeover. The early Christians felt that their use of the name of Jesus was an act which glorified God, because God had worked through Jesus to bring this salvation to mankind. We have seen how Jewish piety thought of healing in God's name, but what of the larger Greco-Roman world?

In terms of Greco-Romans conceptions, we have seen that it was a common perception that numinous names could effect many miraculous feats, healing included. What deserves special notice is the belief that one would do well to invoke the most powerful deity. Naturally the most powerful deity had the greatest 'numen', i.e. the power needed to force into submission the various spirits and deities. Remember too, that the Greeks and the Romans, no less than the Jews, believed that illness were caused by demons. Given that early Gentile converts invoked the name of Jesus, we can infer that they believed that Jesus was the cosmocrator, able to command all other spiritual forces, inclusive of spirits of illness. The corollary, which these Gentile Christians no doubt drew, was that Jesus, as the cosmocrator, had been elevated to a plane ordinarily reserved for God; in short, Jesus was now co-regent with God. It is truly amazing that a historical figure, especially a crucified Jew, could be seen in this light at any point in history, let alone a scant few decades after his crucifixion. In my view, the only way to account for this development is that people were moved by demonstrations of power, done in Jesus' name, to believe that Jesus was Lord over all creation, and this belief entailed also the acceptance that Jesus' name was now the supreme name of power.

II. The name of Jesus as a symbol for Jesus himself.

SPECIAL SCRIBAL TREATMENT OF THE NAME OF JESUS

In this section I shall review the various shards of evidence that will hopefully fill the lacuna in our knowledge of the generative processes that produced the *nomina sacra*, and their relevance to my study on the use of the name of Jesus. My task shall be to attempt to piece these

fragments together and build a plausible picture of the possible pathways that led to the origin of the *nomina sacra*. From this starting point I shall then show the christological significance of this development, and finally how this development stacks up against the Greco-Roman and Jewish materials. But before I embark on this task it would be helpful to tender a précis on the material facts about the *nomina sacra*.⁸¹²

The ‘*nomina sacra*’ is the designation conferred upon a select group of approximately fifteen words which are found in various Christian codices. Each word appears to be sacred in nature and this fact was conveyed by the scribe by suspending, or contracting, the word, and concomitantly, placing a superscript line above the word. Unlike some scribal conventions of the time, which simply suspended a common word, the *nomina sacra* practice was at its inception highly selective in the words that were chosen; that is, the system was applied only to sacred names-not common everyday terms. Accordingly, such common *griffonnages* can hardly be seen as putative progenitors of the *nomina sacra*, a conclusion that I shall support shortly.

From a chronological vantage point the fifteen words may be conveniently grouped into three classes. The first group consists of four words which from the earliest manuscripts are treated as *nomina sacra*, viz. Jesus, Kyrios, God, and Christos. These four are invariably treated as *nomina sacra* in every extant New Testament manuscript in which the system appears. Indeed, as Roberts puts it “their universality is as striking as their antiquity.”⁸¹³ To this we may add the important observation that of these four only the name of Jesus is found in suspension. This bimodal distribution may suggest that the name of Jesus was the embryonic name; that is, it was the first to be treated as a *nomen sacrum*.⁸¹⁴

⁸¹² For a fuller exposition see Colin H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 26-48.

⁸¹³ *Ibid.*, 28. In Roberts’ schema these two observations merge and lead to the conclusion that the system was not built incrementally or without forethought but is the product of some centralization and input from authoritative sectors within early Christianity. While the notion of central authoritative centers controlling the process is questionable, the belief that the system had input (i.e. approval) presumably from respected figures, seems possible.

⁸¹⁴ Schuyler Brown, who believes that *kyrios* was the initial *nomen sacrum*, has not accepted Roberts’ conjecture. Brown proposes that insofar as Jesus received the divine appellation, *kyrios*, and insofar as this title had previously belonged to God, then when *kyrios* became the first *nomen sacrum* it follows that Jesus’ other title *christos* would be similarly treated. Moreover, since the title ‘Lord’ applied equally to both Jesus and God it then follows that the word *theos* would be included. However, this proposition can be easily dismissed for one can explain both words if we propose that Jesus’ name came first, and then at a later date other copyists who were unaware of the meaning applied the system to the whole compound name ‘Lord Jesus Christ.’ In fact, within the New Testament “Lord Jesus” occurs by my count 41 times and “Lord Jesus Christ” occurs 62 times. Thus, once

Now the second group is comprised of three words: cross, man, and Spirit. These appear almost as early as the primary four, but scribes were not consistent in their treatment of these three. Nevertheless they are found with some frequency as *nomina sacra*.

The third class comes from slightly later documents and is composed of eight words: Father (God), Son, Savior, mother (incidentally, only employed when used of the mother of Jesus), heaven, Israel, David, and Jerusalem. Within this group we find that the application of the system was haphazard and Roberts is surely correct when he remarks that the problem for the scribe was determining whether any of these words were originally thought to have had a sacred meaning. No doubt this accounts for the lack of conformity with which these words were treated.

It should also be noted that the purpose of this system was not driven by practical concerns. For example, the words most oft rendered by the method are quite diminutive. In other words, the contraction of a four-letter word (e.g. Θεός) to two letters and a superscript line does not lend itself to a considerable conservation of either time or effort. The same argument could be pressed for some of the other words (e.g. Son, man, etc.) . Certainly if space consideration was the aim then it becomes difficult to explain why other highly repetitive names such as Peter, Paul, or disciples, etc., were not treated as *nomina sacra*.

Beyond the facts that have already been highlighted we should take notice of some peculiarities of the system. First, it would seem evident that the choice of these fifteen words was driven by religious concerns. In fact, almost all of the names can readily be fitted into some convenient religious category.⁸¹⁵ Even *Basileia* might be construed as having a sacred character for the imminent 'Kingdom of God' was a central tenet of Jesus' eschatology. That is not, however, to deny that some names are more readily amenable to this framework than others. Israel, for instance, is not easily admitted into this group at first glance. Was it perhaps because the Church was now viewed as the Israel of God? The chosen elect? Perhaps, but in any event the preponderance of the names can be easily seen to have a certain sacred character.

Jesus had received this treatment other copyists in ignorance of its true meaning simply extended it to the whole name. Later yet, when others simply saw the *nomina sacra* as a system comprising sacred names the next step would have naturally been to extent this treatment to the word *theos*. This would help to explain Brown's dictum that this first class of names are really *nomina divina* (pg. 19, see reference below). In any event, given what I shall argue shortly, that the name of Jesus was subjected to gematrial processes, we shall see that Jesus is once again to be preferred as the original member of the system. For more on Brown's views see, Schuyler Brown, "Concerning the Origin of the Nomina Sacra," *Studia Papyrologica* 9 (1970): 7-19.

⁸¹⁵Roberts, *Manuscripts*, 41.

Now another consideration is the question of why other words were not included? Where is the Logos or Sophia, etc.? Indeed, within Gnostic texts words such as *pleroma* and *bathos* are not treated as *nomina sacra*, but ‘Jesus’ is. Perhaps the answer lies in part in the fact that with few later exceptions the window of opportunity when experimentation was taking place was coming to a close by ca. 150-200 C.E.-but also because such a system was liable to abuse by ever present heterodox groups. Perhaps then, the early Church was not receptive to terms which might be readily pressed into the service of heterodox groups. Whatever the case might be, we need not let this interesting question detain us, for our main objective is to flesh out the main story lines of how the name of Jesus entered into the system.

We should also be aware that this period of experimentation, which as already noted lasted until somewhere in the second century C.E., has implications for any conclusion on how the system arose. This insight has momentous implications for our evaluation, for the nature of this early fluidity prefigures a conclusion that is supported by other lines of evidence, viz. that the lack of a fixed system of terms suggests that the *nomina sacra* were not derived from any antecedent Jewish scribal ortho-praxis (presumably Jewish scribes would have already selected what type of words should be treated and this would serve as the foundation for Christian practice). Further evidence for independent origins can be seen in the fact that the mode of reverential treatment accorded to the ineffable Tetragrammaton in Jewish circles (e.g. paleo-Hebraic script, or writing the letters in gold, etc.) does not seem to extend to the Christian *nomina sacra*. In addition, two further items stand out as supporting this conclusion. Before I take this question up, however, I shall review some other differences between the two scribal practices.

First, the Tetragrammaton was evidently never contracted in the first century.⁸¹⁶ Secondly, as Schuyler Brown has noted, the Greek equivalent for the Tetragrammaton (i.e. *kyrios*) was not given special treatment either scribally, or vocally.⁸¹⁷

In addition, as Brown also noted, most, if not all, Old Testament Greek manuscripts did not write *kyrios* in the place of the Tetragrammaton, but rather wrote the Tetragrammaton in

⁸¹⁶ Alan Millard, “Ancient Abbreviations and the *Nomina Sacra*,” in *The Unbroken Reed. Studies in Culture and Heritage of Ancient Egypt, In Honor of A.F. Shore*, eds. C. Eyre, A. Leahy, L.M. Leahy, (London: The Egyptian Exploration Society, 1994), 223.

⁸¹⁷ Brown, “Concerning the Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*,” 8.

paleo-Hebrew script, or used a transliteration (i.e., $\pi\iota\pi\iota$), within Greek manuscripts in lieu of *kyrios*, to name but a few of the practices.⁸¹⁸ In the one oft-cited case where the word *kyrios* is found in a liturgical document of the first century C.E. it is abundantly clear that *kyrios* was not viewed as a proper surrogate for the Tetragrammaton, and accordingly was not so treated.⁸¹⁹

Moreover, what are we to make of those words that comprise our second and third classes if we cling to a Jewish origins model? In no Jewish liturgical document are they ever accorded, let alone intimated to possess, a sacred character (including even Israel).⁸²⁰ With this in view Roberts provides decisive evidence by pointing out that of the 184 instances of *kyrios* (in a sacred sense), and the 109 cases of the sacred use of *theos* in Greek inscriptions from Palestine (which date from approximately 100 B.C.E. to 130 C.E.), not a single case can be found in contracted form.⁸²¹

Thus, we can concur with Roberts that the introduction of the *nomina sacra* system appeared in the ancient world as a truly novel scribal innovation. Following Roberts then, let us lay to rest the hypothesis of a Jewish origin and let us turn to other conjectures.

If we abandon a Jewish-origins model we must consequently embrace an independent-origins model. Indeed, several lines of evidence point toward the conclusion that the early Christians invented the practice, and at a remarkably early date. For example, this novelty is never mentioned, or even alluded to, by ancient writers. This silence is probably reflective of an early date for the inception of the *nomina sacra*, *after* the advent of the Christian faith. How is this so? If we imagine that the system was thrust upon scribes (or even developed by them) at a later date when professional scribes had taken up copying Christian manuscripts then we might expect some comment (i.e., scholium or marginalia) about what the system means and how it was to be implemented. The absence of any such notation suggests that the system was probably begun at an early date before the introduction of the services of professional scribes, and that

⁸¹⁸ As Roberts takes note even at Qumran the Tetragrammaton was evidently almost always, written to the exclusion of Adonai. Roberts, *Manuscripts*, 30.

⁸¹⁹ Ibid., 30-1. In fact, in the one case where the Tetragrammaton is written in Greek the scribe used $\text{IA}\Omega$, its Greek equivalent. Accordingly, Roberts posits in light of this evidence that the hallmark of a Christian document is finding *kyrios* treated as a *nomen sacrum*.

⁸²⁰ Ibid.

⁸²¹ Ibid., 34.

these later scribes viewed the *nomina sacra* as something already understood and fixed within Christian circles so that they did not feel the need to explain the system (or alternatively, the meaning of the original logic behind the system had already been lost). In any event, whatever the actual series of events, it would seem that the lack of any literary comment or any scholium is easier to explain as an artifact of an early practice and presumes an early date rather than a late date for the origin of the *nomina sacra*. Now that we have addressed this issue, what about the use of the name of Jesus at an early date?

One line of support for an early date is that so-called incipient Gnosticism presents us with suggestive evidence that the suspended form of the name of Jesus was already a relic by 140 C.E. According to Irenaeus, Valentinus and his acolytes developed a fully fleshed out doctrine seemingly based solely on the suspended form of the name of Jesus, and given the favored date for the origin of the various doctrines that some call Gnosticism, this strongly hints that the suspended form existed earlier within antecedent Christianity. In *Adv. Her.* I.III.2 Irenaeus records:

They [Valentinians] also affirm that these eighteen Aeons are strikingly indicated by the first two letters of His name [Ιησοῦς], namely *Iota* and *Eta*. And, in like manner, they assert that the ten Aeons are pointed out by the letter *Iota*, which begins His name...

It is difficult to unravel whether the Valentinians developed this doctrine based solely upon the suspended form of the name of Jesus or whether they struck upon this doctrine independently (i.e., the ‘eighteen’ doctrine came first and was subsequently grafted into the gematria of the *Iota-Eta* letters in Jesus’ name). There are however some considerations that seem to tilt the balance in favor of dependent origins from prior Christian speculation over the number eighteen.

If in fact the doctrine of the eighteen Aeons was derived independently it is difficult to envision how the numerical equivalence of the first two letters of Jesus name could have served as sufficient corroboration of the doctrine. Without the antecedent knowledge that the name of Jesus was represented in manuscripts by ’Ιη, simply claiming that the first two letters of his name equals the purported number of Aeons would have had a highly artificial ring to it. It is not

easy to imagine how such an artifice would have served as a powerful authentication for the doctrine.⁸²²

Why, for example, are there not 218 Aeons if we take the first three letters? Why not 288 Aeons if we take the first four? Without some prior precedent that the name of Jesus was represented by 'Iη any derivative doctrine would appear as a fortuitous coincidence rather than a providential signification that the doctrine was correct. Any hypothesis that embraces an independent origin for the eighteen Aeon doctrine must adequately explain how an initiate would see the cogency in the arbitrary grasping of any numerical combination of letters that coincidentally equaled the number required by the doctrine. Until this is done it would appear that the more parsimonious explanation is that the Valentinians drew upon a well-known example of the suspended name of Jesus. While there is no sure resolution of this interesting question, the most probable explanation remains that they used the suspended form of the name of Jesus as the springboard for their speculation.

Now in order to ferret out the true background for the origin of the *nomina sacra* I must first address the recent attempt by A. Millard to situate the origins the *nomina sacra* within antecedent secular scribal practices. Obviously, if Millard has succeeded where others have failed, then perhaps the invention of the *nomina sacra* was no invention at all.

Now since Roberts publication scant attention has been paid to explicating the origins and significance of the *nomina sacra*. However, Millard has attempted to clear a fresh trail in an article that tries to solve the question of the origin of the *nomina sacra*. Millard's point of departure is his hypothesis that the *nomina sacra* practice was born and nurtured in neither Jewish *nor* Christian circles, but instead within secular scribal circles. Millard has unearthed some textual evidence from both Semitic and non-Semitic sources that clearly indicate that on particular occasions a word might be abbreviated, even to the point that it became customary to signify the word in question by this manner. However, Millard's thesis fails to incorporate

⁸²² Although made in the context of Valentinian exposition on the number 888 as a numerical cipher for the name of Jesus, Irenaeus' comments seem poignant in our context also, and might indicate evidence against my reasoning. Irenaeus states, "The forced character of their calculations respecting the rest becomes clearly manifest. For choosing out of the law whatever things agree with the number adopted in their system, they thus violently strive to obtain proofs of its validity" (*ad Haer.* II.XXIV.2,3). If Irenaeus is accurately reflecting their practices, perhaps then, the Valentinians did strike upon this doctrine independently and then seized upon the name of Jesus to corroborate it.

satisfactorily several pivotal material issues. I shall now enumerate these various shortcomings in Millard's treatment of the data.

One problem that plagues Millard's work is that his data have been collated from disparate eras and provenances. The span of these disparities is enormous.⁸²³ He cites examples from Ebla of a contraction of the words used to signify the numbers one hundred and one thousand respectively (no doubt oft used numbers.)⁸²⁴ Then, Millard adduces evidence that scribes in the Old Babylonian period sometimes contracted the name of the king. Even in the Gilgamesh epic, the hero Gilgamesh, often has his name contracted to ^dGIŠ from the full ^dGIŠ.GIN. MAŠ.⁸²⁵

Millard cites other examples of contraction that are to be explained as having also arisen from utilitarian considerations. For example, Millard himself notes that the predominant number of his examples taken from Punic and Phoenician texts are abbreviations of names on *coins*.⁸²⁶ It is self evident that abbreviation of a name on this medium is governed by the simple concern to fit the name within the circumference of the coin. Millard notes the paucity of similar examples on the more spacious *lamellae* and other tabular media used for inscriptions—a fact which strikes even the casual observer as running counter to Millard's own hypothesis.⁸²⁷ In fact, contraction is not even the predominant mode for rendering a reduced name. Only on *coins* from Byblos, and some Punic earthenware, is true contraction found. And in the case of the latter each contraction was recognizable to *only the owner and several of his or her acquaintances*.⁸²⁸

⁸²³ Millard's work spans no less than four different eras—covering two millennia in all. The evidence is, as he puts it, "very fragmentary as no standard legal deeds, letters, administrative lists or documents...survive outside Egypt." (pg. 221) Thus, his examples are highly selective and do not constitute a formal proof for the establishment that any particular scribal school regularly practiced, let alone formalized, this process in or around the first century C.E.

⁸²⁴ Ibid., 221. To equate this type of numerical notation with the *nomina sacra* is tantamount to comparing scientific notation (e.g. $10^3=1000$) to the *nomina sacra*. Their functions are diametrically opposite. One is religious in nature, the other is simple arithmetic shorthand.

⁸²⁵ Ibid. Given the length of this name one might surmise that this name was abbreviated due to an effort to save space and time in its recording. Again, this is not a suitable model to explain the origin and function of the *nomina sacra*.

⁸²⁶ Ibid. Evidently Millard has ignored or forgotten Robert's admonition that coins by their very nature do not produce good witnesses to manuscript practices. See Roberts, *Manuscripts*, 31.

⁸²⁷ Ibid.

⁸²⁸ Ibid., 222.

As a final blow against the theory, Millard has overlooked the fact that frequently the *nomen sacrum* was written with a space both before and after it in New Testament documents—hardly a practice intended to save space, and this clearly contravenes his theory.⁸²⁹ Thus, Millard has taken a few *non-literary* examples and attempted to transform them into the exemplar of our *literary nomina sacra*. Given Millard's treatment of these examples two observations are in order.

First, what one may readily glean from these examples is that Millard has only demonstrated that scribes have on occasion resorted to contracting a name if it was so oft used in their manuscripts that it would save considerable time simply to abbreviate it. We have already seen that the use of abbreviations, following simple considerations of trying to reduce the amount of time it takes to write common words, do not explain the words that were selected for the *nomina sacra*. He has also not produced a formal solution as to how such practices transcend this utilitarian concern of the scribe, and then from this point explain the deployment of select *sacred* terms as *nomina sacra*.

Now, by the dawn of the era of our concern abbreviations were almost always by suspension, and usually produced on diminutive objects such as coins in a simple, and apparent, effort to save space.⁸³⁰ Within literary texts it is noteworthy that the practice is unattested before the first century C.E., and thereafter it is exceedingly rare.⁸³¹ The examples which Millard adduces demonstrate several pivotal facts. The two most important for my analysis are: first, the practice was restricted to common words that the scribe was likely to encounter time and again in his transcription of his texts (thus cohering with our earlier observation that expediency was the motive for this practice); second, no systematization of any sort had taken place among scribes by the dawn of the Christian Era.⁸³²

In light of this insufficient treatment I think it best to demur from accepting Millard's thesis. His work, while helpful in uncovering the use of abbreviations generally, has nevertheless

⁸²⁹ See Roberts, *Manuscripts*, 35 fn. 2.

⁸³⁰ Ibid.

⁸³¹ Ibid.

⁸³² Ibid.

not offered either a plausible means, nor, and this is the most important omission, the *religious rationale* for creating the *nomina sacra*. I would maintain that the first four *nomina sacra*, viz. Lord, God, Jesus, and Christ, signal us that the motivation was strictly religious in nature, not pragmatic. Clearly, the *raison d'être* of the *nomina sacra* must be sought within the religious ambit of early Christian communities, not per se, within secular scribal circles. On any front, to begin our quest for the origin of the *nomina sacra* I must first unravel the significance of the use of the onomatomantic encryption of the name of Jesus.

That this procedure might help explain the origin of the *nomina sacra* was noted by Roberts who conjectured that perhaps the stimulus for abbreviating the name of Jesus arose through the use of gematria, as evidenced in the Epistle to Barnabas (ca. 130 C.E.). Roberts argues that the number 318 in Genesis (9:8),⁸³³ reflective of the number of Abraham's household, represents both Jesus' name (i.e. by its first two letters *Iη* which equal 18), and salvation, as evidenced by the letter *τ* (which equals 300), which as we know was symbolic of Jesus' cross (and hence salvation). The passage reads:

What, then, was the knowledge given to him in this? Learn the eighteen first, and then the three hundred. The ten and the eight are thus denoted-Ten by I, and Eight by H. You have [the initials of the, name of] Jesus. And because the cross was to express the grace [of our redemption] by the letter T, he says also, "Three Hundred." He signifies, therefore, Jesus by two letters, and the cross by one. He knows this, who has put within us the engrafted gift of His doctrine. No one has been admitted by me to a more excellent piece of knowledge than this, but I know that ye are worthy.

In a helpful commentary in the *Stromata* VI. XI Clement comments on this tradition:

They say, then, that the character representing 300 is, as to shape, the type of the Lord's sign, and that the *Iota* and the *Eta* indicate the savior's name; that it was indicated, accordingly, that Abraham's servants were in salvation who having fled to the Sign and the Name...⁸³⁴

Now the very fact that the author employs gematria with the sure-footedness of someone who has the self assurance that his audience will already understand the *τ* and *Iη symbola* suggests that it was already viewed as conventional by the date of the composition of Barnabas

⁸³³ The author conflated 17:27 which speaks of all of Abraham's household being circumscribed and 14:14 which gives the number of this company as 318.

⁸³⁴ Another example of gematria can be gleaned from *T. Sol.* 6:8, 11:6, and 15:11, where we find gematria played out with respect to Emmanuel. Here the name yields the number 644.

(the first quarter of the second century C.E.).⁸³⁵ Moreover, it would be implausible to believe that the suspended form of Jesus' name was derived from this exegesis originally. The argument is simply too arcane and would require us to believe that the early Church came up with the equation $\text{I}\eta=18$ by teasing it out of this passage. It would seem much more plausible that the early Church already dabbled in onomatomantic procedures and they had already come across the numerical significance of this abbreviation of Jesus' name. As we shall now see, there is much more to the association between the number eighteen and Jesus' name than we have seen here.⁸³⁶

L. Hurtado has taken Roberts' line of argumentation one step further and demonstrated that the superscript line over the *nomen sacrum* follows scribal convention in designating that a word (or letter) is to read as a *number*.⁸³⁷ Now, we have seen earlier that the earliest *nomen sacrum* is probably the suspended form of the name of Jesus. The two letters together (i.e. *Iota* and *Eta*), as we have observed, yield a number of 18. Hurtado conjectures that the number 18 was reflective of the numerical value of the Hebrew word יָל , (i.e., the word for life).⁸³⁸

⁸³⁵ This estimation is derived from taking into account the accepted date for the epistle of ca. 100 to 140 C.E. This is to be taken in conjunction with the apparent ease and comfort with which the scribe places Jesus' name within the system. Therefore, these findings clearly merit our taking seriously an early date for both the system itself, and Jesus' name in particular, as the first of the *nomina sacra*. It should also be noted that the Egerton Papyrus also employs a suspended form of the name of Jesus. Its date has, however, recently been reevaluated and pushed back to ca. 200-250 C.E. Still, Barnabas, corroborates Roberts' basic premise concerning the time of origination and the order of the names as they entered into the system.

⁸³⁶ Further evidence for this tradition can be found with Valentinus. Later Valentinians in fact suggested that the number eighteen was reflective of the fact that Jesus' last stay on earth lasted 18 months. Dornseiff cites Usener as his source for this information. See *Das Alphabet*, 131. Dornseiff does not cite a page number but he quotes from Usener's *Weihnachsfest* just before this, citing page 23. It is not readily apparent from Dornseiff's quotation exactly what these later Valentinians had in mind but the example that it furnishes suffices to illustrate the abiding interest in the number eighteen.

⁸³⁷ L.W. Hurtado, "The Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*: A Proposal," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 117/4 (1998): 655-673.

⁸³⁸ So Erich Bischoff, *Die Mystik und Magie der Zahlen* (Berlin: Hermann Barsdorf Verlag, 1920), 225. Of possible interest is Bischoff's claim that the name of David was rendered as 18 in kabalistic gematria in spite of the fact that the Vaw normally counted as 6 and not 10. If the roots of this variant reach into the first century then perhaps the number 18 came to symbolize a Son-of-David christology, as well as life. As for the general import of the concept of life in both biblical and non-biblical religions of the Near East see Ernst Percy, *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der Johanneischen Theologie: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Gnostizismus*, (Lund: Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandeln, 1939), 307-340. Further insight on what a "life" theology may have involved comes from the Mandaean religion. Here, as in Judaism, the concept of life was sacred and the word itself came to designate the Lord of the world of light. This is clearly seen in the numerous Mandaean incantation bowls where the adherent performs the rites in the name of Life. In this context, it is most interesting to observe that the Mandaen baptismal sect held cultic acts to be the fountain of salvation—a belief not generally in keeping with Gnostic

In summation, we have viewed several possible avenues for the origin of the *nomina sacra*.⁸³⁹ When all is said and done, it seems to me that the gematria model put forth by L. Hurtado holds the most promise. While Roberts' conjecture of ΑΩ imagery underwriting the practice of writing the contracted form of the name of Jesus is interesting it leaves unanswered both why the suspended form arose, and more telling, it fails to explain the fact that the first *nomen sacra* was, as far as we can tell, the suspended form of Jesus' name. These same shortcomings are found in the other options I listed. Also, only a numerical model can explain the bi-modal distribution of Jesus' name (i.e. suspended and contracted). I shall now turn to my analysis of the significance of the special scribal treatment of the name of Jesus.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH GRECO-ROMAN AND JEWISH MATERIALS

We have covered several different pathways which might explain the origin of the *nomina sacra*. But what does this special scribal treatment mean? And how does it compare with Greco-Roman and Jewish materials? This latter question needs to be addressed first before we can come to any conclusions about the meaning and function of the *nomina sacra*.

In terms of Jewish practices, we saw in the section on the Jewish materials that God's name was accorded special scribal treatment. The methods by which this special treatment was achieved were variable however. At times the divine name was written in paleo-Hebrew, sometimes it was offset and written in gold letters. Other techniques included separating the divine name from the sentence by adding extra empty spaces before and after the Name, abbreviating the divine name (ⲡ) or by substituting dots for the Name. As variable as these treatments were, their meaning and function were not. Basically, these special scribal methods were designed to signify that the divine name was holy, and, correspondingly, it was not to be treated in a cavalier fashion. In the case of the use of paleo-Hebrew, another concern may have been to write the Name in a form that was not readily discerned by the common person and this

thought but completely harmonious with Jewish beliefs-especially its emphasis on water baptism and lustrations. This has led Rudolph, among others, to suggest that Mandaeanism's roots can be traced to Jewish soil. This is not surprising as the Mandaeans derive from a milieu rife with Jewish and Jewish-Christian baptismal sects. See Hermann Lichtenberger, "Synkretistische Züge in jüdischen und judenchristlichen Taufbewegungen," in *Jews and Christians: The parting of the ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. James D.G. Dunn, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992), 95 and Kurt Rudolph, *Gnosis. The Nature and History of Gnosticism*. Trans. Robert McL. Wilson, (San Francisco: Harper, 1987), 360. For insight into the role which the term 'life' plays in Johannine theology see Percy, *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der Johanneischen Theologie*, 307-340.

⁸³⁹ For the interested reader I include some other conjectures in Appendix Seven.

in turn would prohibit the proper articulation of the Name in cases of misuse (especially in magic). Of course, this is nothing more than speculation. What remains certain is that scribes treated the divine name in a fashion, which signified its holy and exalted status. Having brought to mind these basic facts, let us turn to the *nomina sacra*.

It should be clear that the impetus which generated the creation of the *nomina sacra* were quite different from the factors which drove the scribal treatment of the divine Name. Moreover, the actual system was a *de novo* invention by the early Church. Hurtado, in fact, has drawn attention to the fact that the system was the first tangible material evidence for an emergent Christian material culture.⁸⁴⁰ Additionally, the factors which underwrote this system were different from the Old Testament scribal practices concerning the name of God. In the case of the latter, the concern which fueled its use was that of sanctification of the Name. In short, the scribes put up a 'hedge' around the Name so to speak, to keep it from being profaned. With respect to the name of Jesus we find an altogether different situation. In the case of Christianity, there was no prohibition concerning the articulation of the name of Jesus. Nonetheless, if Hurtado is correct about the numerical significance of the name of Jesus, then it was onomatomanism (which has as one of its manifestations gematria) which brought about the creation of the *nomina sacra*, not per se any attempt to put up a hedge around the name of Jesus' along the exact same lines as the Tetragrammaton, but perhaps this is a difference without a distinction. Was not Jesus' name seen to be special, if not divine, *because* (in part) of the 'truths' uncovered by gematrial treatment? Let us look a bit closer at this now.

Clearly, the earliest Christians believed that they had uncovered a profound truth about Jesus himself in the 'numbers' of Jesus' name, both in its suspended *nomem sacrum* form, and its full form (i.e., the name 'Jesus' equals 888). Now since the first *nomen sacrum* derives from Greco-Roman numerological conventions, I will need therefore to look a bit deeper into the meaning of the number which Jesus' name signifies in order to uncover just what some of these truths were.

As regarding the number 888, in order to apprehend correctly its significance we must take into account the structural framework that makes up the backbone of the Book of Revelation. More pointedly, I refer here to the purposeful antinomies that the writer constructed

⁸⁴⁰ Hurtado, "The Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*," 672.

between Jesus and the beast. A schematic will allow us to rapidly comprehend the antithetic parallelism.

BEAST	JESUS
1) The beast is killed, but is resurrected (13: 3; 12)	Jesus died and was resurrected (1:5)
2) The beast comes in his parousia (13:1)	Jesus comes in his parousia (19:11-16).
3) The beast, “was and is not and will come” (17: 8)	Jesus is described in similar fashion (1:4)
4) The beast will place his name upon the forehead of his followers (13:16-17;14:11)	The name of Jesus and the Father is to be placed upon the forehead of the elect (3:2; 14:1; 22:4).
5) The beast has ten diadems (13:1) and each head had a blasphemous name.	Jesus wears many diadems which have a secret name written upon them (19:12).

What do these antinomies indicate? Well, first, we need to observe that the well known, but cryptic reference in Rev.13:18 “[this] calls for wisdom: let anyone calculate the number of *the beast*, for it is the number of *a person*. Its number is six hundred sixty six” seems to suggest the possibility of the application of *isopsephism* given the apposition between these two figures.⁸⁴¹

Now, it is widely recognized that the number of the beast is probably a numerical cipher for Nero.⁸⁴² The name Νερωϋ Καῖσαρ, when written in Hebrew characters, equals 666. Bauckham, however, trenchantly noted that the name of the beast (θηρίον), when translated into Hebrew (תֵּרִיּוֹן), and then subjected to onomatomantic procedures, yields the number 666-the same number as the man.⁸⁴³ Thus, the number of the beast *is* the number of the man.

If this position is correct then the writer is saying, *in nuce*, that Nero, and all that he represents (i.e. Roman power, the pagan system of worship, etc.) is ‘beastly’; that is, he belongs to the present evil world. If this is true, what then are we to make of such a conflation? To answer this we must first recognize that the parlance of the author, and most probably his readers, was derived from the rich symbolic palette that is the imagery of the Old Testament, and

⁸⁴¹ Isopsephism is the procedure whereby two words are shown to be connected (or even the same) because they share the same numerical values.

⁸⁴² Richard Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 387-8.

⁸⁴³ *Ibid.*, 389.

this is where we need to look to find our answer. Others though, such as Richard Bauckham, propose other backdrops to this narrative. I shall look at this now.

Bauckham proposes that the symbolism comes from a complex association of Pythagorean number symbolism.⁸⁴⁴ It is at this juncture that I must part company with Bauckham, for while Bauckham finds meaning in these tangled numerical complexes, his construct rests upon the proposition that John, or his audience, were well versed in Pythagorean number theory. It seems to me that it is improbable that at this most foundational connection in the author's narrative web (signaled no doubt by this crucial linguistic hinge; ὁ ἔχων τοῦτον ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου) the author suddenly leaps from the primary colors of the Old Testament, with which he paints his picture elsewhere to the darker, or should I say murkier colors of Pythagorean mathematical theory. Given this conclusion, I must turn instead to the more proximal realm of Jewish number symbolism.

At this point I must submit that it is no mere coincidence that the number of the beast (i.e., 666) is so appropriately aligned with the name of Jesus (which equals 888). Perhaps these numerical equivalents are intended to function over and against one another in a sort of *inverse* isopsephism. Such an antinomy comports well with what we have already seen of the author's narrative style. With this in mind let us take a quick inventory of Jewish and Christian number symbolism and what it might tell us about the meaning of the numbers 666 and 888.

The number six is the number associated with the first creation. It was on the sixth day that God rested from His creative endeavors (Gen.2: 2). Philo, who is otherwise enamored with Pythagorean number symbolism, nevertheless reverts to Genesis when he speaks of the creation and says, "And the world was created under the number six."⁸⁴⁵

In contrast, the number eight is symbolic of the new creation.⁸⁴⁶ What is really being expressed here is that Jesus was, by the reckoning of the Jewish calendar system, raised on the

⁸⁴⁴ Ibid., 390-4. Bauckham finds corroboration for his theory in v. 17:11, where Nero is, 'of the seven,' but is also 'an eighth.' Bauckham proposes that since 666 is the eighth "doubly triangular" number in Pythagorean number symbolism, the text therefore, speaks of Nero as an 'eighth.' It seems to me that a more parsimonious explanation is that the Nero *redivivus* legend would make the resurrected Nero 'the eighth' Caesar although originally he was "of the seventh." In any event, for further details of Bauckham's views see Bauckham, *The Climax*, 395-6.

⁸⁴⁵ *Quae. et Sol. Gen.*, 2.17.

⁸⁴⁶ See Willy Rordorf, *Sunday: the history of the day of rest and worship in the earliest centuries of the Christian church*, trans. by A. A. K. Graham from the German, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 276 and

eighth day. As the first-fruits of the new creation, Jesus represents the incorruptible new era: its resplendent glory and holiness, which are traits of the new age. Mimicking Philonic phraseology, we might say that the number eight is the number under which God has created the new creation, and Jesus' name, is the 'true name' which symbolizes the new creation for its number is 888.⁸⁴⁷

We find further evidence for this belief by the end of the first century C.E. when the so-called Lord's Day was also metaphorically named 'the eighth day' for precisely the reasons cited above.⁸⁴⁸ Its deep symbolic significance is made clear in *The Epistle to Barnabas* (15:8), where the author pushes the idea that God had annulled the old dispensation with the new order, whose metaphysical siglum was the number eight. God begins his comparison with the Sabbath:

Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to Me, but that is which I have made, [namely this] when, giving rest to all things, I shall make a beginning of the eighth day, that is, *a beginning of another world* [emphasis mine]. Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead.

Justin (*Dialogue* 41.4) also conceives of the eighth day as symbolic of the uprooting of the old order, in this case, however, he targets circumcision and says:

The command of circumcision bidding always circumcise the children on the eighth day, was a type of the true circumcision, by which we are circumcised...through him who rose from the dead on Sunday ...For Sunday, remaining the first of all days, is called however *the eighth*...and [yet] remains the first...

And again, at *Dialogue* 24, Justin says:

Now, sirs,...it is possible for us to show how the eighth day possessed a certain mysterious import, which the seventh day did not possess, and which was promulgated by God through these rites. [circumcision]

Richard Bauckham, "Sabbath and Sunday in the Post-Apostolic Church," in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation*, (Grand Rapids Mich.: Zondervan, 1982), 273-275. Bauckham rightly stresses the eschatological significance of the new creation.

⁸⁴⁷ The symbolic significance of the number eight must surely come from Jewish mystical circles. Attempts to derive its import from contemporary Greco-Roman numerology seem doomed to frustration. As Staats has pointed out, with the possible exception of one reference in Plato (*Resp.* 10.616), the only Greco-Roman authors who discuss the symbolism of the number are Theon of Smyrna (ca. second century C.E.) and Macrobius (ca. fourth century C.E.), and both of these are too late to serve as sources. Moreover, Pythagoras thought that arithmetic and the musical scale taught that the number eight was not a 'complete number' (*Problem*, 2.47; *Ideler.*, 1.65)! Given the paucity of any citations concerning the number eight, combined with the chronologically late examples which are extant, we must conclude that this evidence seems to imply that efforts to derive its significance from Greco-Roman speculation will prove fruitless. For further insight see Reinhart Staats, "Ogdoas als ein Symbol für die Auferstehung," *Vigiliae Christianae* 26.1 (1972): 37-38.

⁸⁴⁸ Ibid., 277.

Justin later on (*Dialogue* 138), makes the comparison between the salvation which Noah experienced and its symbolic representation of the saving day of the Resurrection and the number eight. He writes:

By this which God said was meant that the mystery of saved men appeared in the deluge. For righteous Noah, along with the other mortals at the deluge, i.e., with his own wife, his three sons and their wives, being eight in number, were a symbol of the eighth day, wherein Christ appeared when He rose from the dead, for ever the first in power.⁸⁴⁹

Of further interest, in a very cryptic passage in the *Stromata* (VI. XVI), Clement attempts to unpack non-orthodox (i.e. Gnostic) exegetical techniques which employ number symbolism.

After addressing the Transfiguration, Clement quite abruptly takes up the theme of the incarnation and says that some of the non-orthodox maintain that:

...while He [Jesus] by His birth, which was indicated by the sixth conspicuously marked [being born in the old order?], *becoming the eighth* [the resurrected Jesus?; emphasis mine], might appear to be God in the body of flesh, by displaying his power being *indeed numbered as a man* [emphasis mine], but by being concealed as to who he was.

Ignatius in his *Epistle to the Magnesians* IX, where he unfolds his understanding of the significance of the eighth day and Jesus' resurrection, writes:

And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's Day as a festival, the resurrection-day, the queen and chief of all the days [of the week]. Looking forward to this, the prophet declared, "To the end, for the eighth day," on which our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death was obtained in Christ...

This same line of reasoning also crept into Valentinian theology with the introduction of the Ogdoad, which was also considered synonymous with the 'the Lord's Day'.⁸⁵⁰

The fact that both heterodox and orthodox groups produced doctrines which coalesced around the Ogdoas seems to indicate a date for the origin of the Ogdoas doctrine at a relatively early date. If this tentative conclusion is correct then the Ogdoas doctrine must have arisen by no later than the last half of the first century C.E. within Christian circles.⁸⁵¹

⁸⁴⁹ Cf. I Peter 3: 20-21.

⁸⁵⁰ Clement's *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 589.

⁸⁵¹ A quick perusal may lead one to posit that the Ogdoas doctrine was given birth in Gnostic circles. But this conclusion is marred by the utilization of the Ogdoas doctrine in the heavily anti-Gnostic polemical work, *Epistula apostolorum* where it is said that Jesus claims, "I have been in the Eight-ness, which is the **Κυριακή**." As quoted in Staats, "Ogdoas als ein Symbol für die Auferstehung," 36. Staats does not cite the passage, but rather Carl Schmidt's, *Gespräche Jesu mit seiner Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, TU 43, (Leipzig, 1919), 61. The line that I cite is my English rendition of the German translation given in Staats.

In any event, if we are in fact following the correct trail then the juxtaposition of 666 to 888 reflects the various antinomies that the author has erected between the beast and Jesus. 1) Unlike Jesus, the beast belongs to the first creation, and thus he cannot, and will not, be resurrected. Although some fancy him as an “eighth” (Rev. 17:11) after his resurrection, he is but of this creative order and thus he is a “seventh,” and accordingly, he is not the inaugurator of the divine Kingdom; 2) Because the beast is a creature he is not worthy to be worshipped, whereas Jesus, being the first born of the new creation (cf. Col.1:18; 1 Cor. 15:20, 23) is worthy of obeisance.

Moreover we can also add, and this would be of signal importance to Greek proselytes to Christianity, that the numerical equivalent for the name of Jesus 888 shows it to be a “true” name—a name which has been enfranchised with potent (magical?) dynamis.⁸⁵² As an aside, it is interesting to note that all of this is reminiscent of the latter speculation in Talmudic Judaism where Metatron was ‘shown’ to be a sort of ‘lesser’ God because the numerical rendering of his name equaled Shaddai (i.e., 314).⁸⁵³ With this said, I will summarize the meaning and significance of the special scribal treatment of the name of Jesus.

One reason why the name of Jesus was thought to be worthy of special scribal treatment is due to the birth of a resurrection christology. This christology was first rooted in the ministry and position, as well as the resurrection itself, and then ‘discovered’ in the very name of Jesus. This christology maintained that since Jesus was the first born from the dead, and subsequently raised to God’s right hand, he was now the Lord of life—including eternal resurrected life. The gematria (i.e., 18), and the christology which it supported, conferred upon the name of Jesus a special sacred character. Although the process may have begun in gematrial speculation which revealed a distinct christology; a christology rooted in the belief that Jesus was divine, it nonetheless quickly lost its gematrial moorings and ended up mimicking the intent of the Jewish scribal treatment accorded to the Tetragrammaton; that is, Jesus’ name was simply seen as sacred quite apart from gematrial maneuvers and it was treated accordingly. Likewise, the gematria on the full name of Jesus (i.e. 888), although not a part of the *nomina sacra*, also suggests that the

⁸⁵² This observation is indebted to Benko who briefly comments upon this in his work, Stephen Benko, *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 135 n 57.

⁸⁵³ Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, 262.

name of Jesus was seen as divine and worthy of special scribal treatment. Thus, the name of Jesus was treated with the same reverence that the divine name received, and this suggests that Jesus was believed to be part of the divine reality.

CONFESSING OR DENYING THE NAME OF JESUS

Another striking use of the name of Jesus can be seen in the contention of the early Church that the name of Jesus was to be confessed or acknowledged. The obvious counterpart to this is denying the name of Jesus. As Justin makes plain (*Dialogue with Trypho*, 30), the Christian is one who is made manifest by "...the fact that...threatened with death, we do not deny his name."⁸⁵⁴

Now before I take up the individual citations it would be worthwhile to look at the meaning of the term "confession." I shall adhere, with some loose alterations, to the outline delivered by Neufeld in his now classic work *The Earliest Christian Confessions*.⁸⁵⁵

In essence, a confession, at least as it is found in classical Hebrew sources [i.e. כִּי] connotes agreement or correspondence between persons or things.⁸⁵⁶ In similar fashion, in the Greek world the noun form [ὁμολογία], as early as a Herodotus and Thucydides, also conveyed the meaning of agreement, including, within political contexts, the meaning of a compact (i.e. treaties).⁸⁵⁷ In the papyri the word group often takes on legal outlines and means essentially the making of a legal contract or agreement.⁸⁵⁸

Now the use of the term *homologeîn* within the Septuagint, where it occurs 23 times, is hardly fixed. Within the Septuagint the term is rather fluid and was used to translate four different Hebrew words.⁸⁵⁹ New nuances, such as to make a vow or create an oath, were coined using the word *homologia* or its compounds. Among its compounds *exhomologia* becomes

⁸⁵⁴ Other Christian texts also attest to confessing the name of Jesus. Justin, in his *Dialogue* (39), describes Christians as those "who confess the name of Christ until he come again."

⁸⁵⁵ Vernon H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), 13-24.

⁸⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁸⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁸⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

increasingly used to signify praise or thanksgiving when suitable.⁸⁶⁰ In spite of this, there are significant exceptions where in certain texts *homologia* means to confess openly or proclaim (e.g., Tobit 12: 22; 13: 3; II Macc. 7: 37). As Neufeld points out, the new meaning of praise or thanksgiving is derivative in nature; coming as it does from the basic meaning of, ‘acknowledge’ or, ‘admit openly,’ a meaning implied also in the Hebrew word הָדַר. In point of fact, Neufeld states that “the meaning of *exhomologeîn* is basically to declare openly, as seen predominantly in the Septuagint...”⁸⁶¹ Not surprisingly, the religious nuances of the word rarely entered into non-Jewish or non-Christian literature.⁸⁶²

We find that within early Christian literature all the expected semantic baggage from the Septuagint has been carried over but with one important difference, viz. the term increasingly is utilized with specific reference to expressing a particular emphasis on “confessing Christ,”⁸⁶³ and, “the *homologia* represented the agreement or consensus in which the Christian community was united, that core of essential conviction and belief to which Christians subscribed and openly testified. The *homologia* was the admission and acknowledgement of the individuals’ loyalty to Jesus Christ, and as such represented a personal testimony of his faith. The *homologia* was the confession of Jesus with specific reference to his person or work, and was therefore *christological in character* [emphasis mine].”⁸⁶⁴ Not unexpectedly, this christological orientation led to the development where the word group became deeply associated with the term ‘martyr,’ for the Christian confession itself led to persecution. Even early on, according to Jn. 9:22, the Jews expelled those who publicly confessed Jesus as the Messiah. This sense of ‘confessing’ in the face of hostile witnesses is even claimed to have taken place in the trial of Jesus, for as I Tim. 6: 13 states concerning Jesus’ behavior during his trial, “Christ Jesus, who testified the good confession before Pontius Pilate.”

⁸⁶⁰ Ibid., 14. Indeed it occurs in over 100 instances with the meaning of praise or giving thanks. See also Pg. 15.

⁸⁶¹ Ibid., 15.

⁸⁶² Ibid., 16.

⁸⁶³ Ibid., 7.

⁸⁶⁴ Ibid., 20.

Yet another type of confession was 'to bear witness' in a legal or religious sense. Found in the Gospel tradition, and highly nuanced there, it occurs in Lk. 12:8 and Mt. 10:32. For example, Jesus demands confession of himself, and in turn Jesus will confess to the Father those who confess him; in short, he becomes *their* eschatological witness to the Father at the end time judgment.

Given the stated intent in several New Testament passages that Christians should identify with Christ in his suffering, and bear up under the same abuse that he suffered, we can see that this call to suffering accords well given the historical fact that the mere confession of the name was a source of persecution directed toward Christians. On any showing Neufeld's conclusion that "the *homologia* has the function of promoting or preserving faithfulness in a time of difficulty and persecution" has repercussions for how we understand those confessions which have the name of Jesus as their object.⁸⁶⁵

Another use was in the making of solemn statements of faith; that is, to confess something in faith. For example, Rom. 10:9-10 (cf. Dt. 30:14) links faith and confession (cf. 2 Cor. 4:13). Confession and proclamation stem from faith. In the view of the early Church, confession is an eschatological responsibility of Christians (e.g., 1 Cor. 4:14) and holds out the promise of eschatological salvation (Rom. 10:9-10; cf. Acts 23:8).

Yet another type of confession is where a person confesses sins (1 Jn. 1:9; cf. the opposite action in 1:8). Similarly, in Rom. 14:11-12 Paul develops this use of confession when he says:

It is written: "'As surely as I live,' says the Lord,
'every knee will bow before me; every tongue will confess to God.'"

¹² So then, each of us will give an account of himself [confess their actions or sins] to God.

Indeed, before Jesus, the message of the Baptist involved public confession of sin as an integral component of conversion (e.g., Mk. 1:5; par.; cf. James 5:16; Acts 19:18).

Of all the uses of confession, none were more significant than its adoption in the cultic sense of 'to confess' (e.g. Phil. 2:11; Rev. 4:8, 11; 5:9ff.; 12:10). This cultic and religious sense is very prominent in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and it would be helpful to take a look at how the concept of confession functions in this Epistle.

⁸⁶⁵ Ibid., 137.

Neufeld has observed that *homologia* serves a different function in Hebrews than the rest of the New Testament. Neufeld notes that in the Epistle to the Hebrews *homologia* is not to acknowledge something presented in the Epistle but it is rather adherence *to* a *homologia* which was already known to the readers.⁸⁶⁶ Indeed, the expression, ‘to cling to,’ in 4: 14 and, ‘to hold fast to’ in 10: 23, signify something that they already adhere to; not something that they are to begin to believe in. It is interesting to note with reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews the extraordinary significance that the term “confess,” and its variants, play. For example in 3: 1 the author speaks of Jesus as the “object of our confession (ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν),” while in 4:14 the term confession stands for the entire Christian faith and is something that they must cling to (ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας). Although interesting, these passages do not directly show us what confession of Jesus’ name means, so I shall take up this issue now.

Interestingly, the expression ‘confess the name of Jesus,’ is nowhere found in the New Testament.⁸⁶⁷ One of the earliest references (although it speaks of the name ‘Christ’) is found in Justin’s *First Apologia* 45, where we find that confessing the name of Christ is not only the boundary marker which indicates those who belong to the Christian community, but also serves as a cause of persecution. Justin states that the believing community everywhere both embraces, and teaches, confession of the name of Christ. Here there is little doubt that Justin’s reference should be read in light of the earliest Christian confession, viz. Jesus is Lord (Rom. 10:9).

Another instructive passage, albeit in a completely different fashion, is found in Irenaeus’ *Adv. Haer.* 4.17.6. Irenaeus picks up a line of argumentation that is strikingly similar to that employed by the author of the Gospel of John. Unlike John, however, Irenaeus contends that the name of the Son belongs to the Father and demonstrates unification between the Father and the Son (whereas the author of John, at 17:26, states that Jesus ‘knows’ the Father’s name; another way of saying that Jesus and the Father are unified). In the case of Irenaeus, he claim’s that the Father also confesses the name of Jesus to be his own: a claim in keeping with the traditions of

⁸⁶⁶ Ibid., 136.

⁸⁶⁷ It is not clear whether Rom. 10:9 should be taken to imply confession of the *name* of Jesus, rather than confess his lordship over creation. The text reads: ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματι σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ. It seems to me that the natural sense is to confess the lordship of Jesus, rather than his name. Of course, to confess the Name, *is* to confess Jesus’ lordship, so perhaps some connection exists. Might the confession in Rom. 10:9 form the springboard for the later confession of the name of Jesus?

the Church. The Father does so because the name of Jesus is actually His own. Here Irenaeus, co-opting the passage in Malachi which speaks of sacrifices to the divine name, points out that offerings in the form of prayers are offered to God, based in part on the rationale that “the name of the Son belongs to the Father.” Given the conflation between Jesus and the Tetragrammaton in the claim that the name of Jesus is God’s very own name, then the passage in Malachi can be construed as meaning that the name of Jesus is not only the medium through which sacrifices are offered to God but also the accepted *symbolon* for God himself. Irenaeus states:

But what other name is there which is glorified among the Gentiles than that of our Lord, by whom the Father is glorified...because it is [the name] of His own Son, who was made man by Him, He calls it His own. Just as a king, if he himself paints a likeness of his son, is right in calling this likeness his own, for both these reasons, because it is [the likeness] of his son, and because it is his own production; *so also does the Father confess the name of Jesus Christ, which is throughout all the world glorified in the Church, to be His own* [emphasis mine] both because it is that of His Son, and because He who thus describes it gave Him for the salvation of men. Since, therefore, *the name of the Son belongs to the Father, and since in the omnipotent God the Church makes offerings through Jesus Christ, He says well on both these grounds, "And in every place incense is offered to My name, and a pure sacrifice." Now John, in the Apocalypse, declares that the "incense" is "the prayers of the saints* [emphasis mine].”

With these examples and definitions in hand let us turn to analyzing this act of confession in light of comparative examples.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

Within a Jewish context acknowledgement or confessing the name of YHWH is paralleled in several intertestamental Jewish texts. For example, the *Ladder of Jacob* 7:35 speaks of “those who acknowledge His name will not be ashamed.” Although derived from the Christian interpolation portion of II Esdras, a similar thought concerning the name of God is found at II Esdras 2:45, which states the following concerning those who have cast off their mortal coil and now praise God:

He answered and said unto me, These be they that have put off the mortal clothing, and put on the immortal, and have confessed the name of God: now are they crowned, and receive palms...

The reader may recall that Josephus speaks of confessing God in the legal sense, over and against a similar confession for Caesar. Josephus was referring here to the Jewish martyrs who, though wracked with pain and subjected to untold horrors, refused to confess that Caesar was

their Lord (in the religious sense).⁸⁶⁸ Indeed, it is exactly in this same sense that the passage in Isa. 26:13 rings out, “O LORD our God, other masters besides You have ruled us; But through You alone we confess Your name.” By refusing to confess the name of Caesar, the martyrs were confirming that they belong to YHWH (=follow) alone. The name functions here as a symbol for God as well as the religious beliefs of the community. By confessing the Name, the Jew was confessing his allegiance to YHWH devotion, and to the covenantal relationship which God had instituted.

In a more polemically tainted passage, Josephus (*BJ* 7.417-418) refers to the Jewish refusal to acknowledge Caesar as Lord (cf. 2 Macc. 7:37). He describes them as those:

Whose courage, or whether we ought to call it madness, or hardiness in their opinions, everybody was amazed at; (418) for when all sorts of torments and vexations of their bodies that could be devised were made use of them, they could not get anyone of them to comply so far as to confess or seem to confess, that Caesar was their lord; but they preserved their own opinion, in spite of all the distress they were brought to, as if they received these torments and the fire itself with bodies insensible of pain, and with a soul that in a manner rejoiced under them.

Now something similar stands behind the narrative in Acts 19: 28, where Paul the apostle is confronted in the theatre of Ephesus with the chant, “Great is Artemis of the Ephesians!” This chant is certainly a religious confession in its fullest sense. We can see here, that a religious confession can encapsulate in some fashion the beliefs of a group concerning some aspect of their deity.

Further uses of the term are seen in cases where one confesses-sometimes in the name of another-that one had transgressed in some manner and now seeks repentance and reconciliation. This usage was framed in such a fashion so as to emphasize the role which the divine name played in such confessions. For example, in 1 Kings 8:35 we read of Solomon interceding for Israel, and he asks God to hear His people when they pray toward the Temple because it is the place “which you said, My Name shall be there.” Solomon then goes on to importune God to forgive Israel when they repent and confess His name:

When the heavens are shut up and there is no rain, because they have sinned against Thee, and they pray toward this place and *confess Thy Name* [emphasis mine] and turn from their sin.

⁸⁶⁸ *BJ* 7.417-418; cf. 2 Macc. 7:37.

Similar examples of this phenomenon are found, as we have already seen, in II Chron. 6:24 and I Ki 8:33, to name but a few. We know also that in later Judaism confession of sin was paired with penitential prayer. Great men of the past publicly confessed their guilt (e.g., Dan. 9:1ff.; Jdt. 9:1ff., etc.). This confession was naturally a function of repentance before God.⁸⁶⁹

Finally, we should recall that Intertestamental Judaism claimed that only those who confessed God's name would receive divine power (e.g., *Psalms of Solomon* 15.2). Here, the Name serves as a symbol for God Himself. It also symbolizes the power which resides within God. Moreover, because the person who confesses God's name belongs to God he/she can be authorized to receive God's power (cf. Jn. 1:12). Within early Christian texts there are no passages that I am aware of which state explicitly that only those who confess Jesus' name will receive power. As a practical matter, however, as the miracles in the Book of Acts demonstrate, only those who confess Jesus (=confessing his name) receive power from God. Such confession contains within itself the objective of acknowledging the power and the exclusive salvation of Jesus.

Taken altogether, it is clear that for the Torah-faithful the Name was the preeminent source of authority, forgiveness and access to God. Indeed, it was a symbol for God Himself. Not surprisingly then, these various functions placed the Name at the very heart of cultic activities. By mediating access to God, the Name had to be placed, by necessity, at the very core of the cultus. For the very essence of the cultus is to be a setting whereby God and man are brought together. This placement makes it all the more remarkable that the name of Jesus came to play this same role in the Christian cult. Replacing God's name with Jesus is *very* surprising given the place of confession in *monotheistic* religions. Let us look at this side of the question briefly.

In a monotheistic context, the central role of confession in establishing the foundations of monotheistic scruples cannot be overstated. Gladigow, in his review of confession in polytheistic religions, comments that "Der Gedanke der Konversion (und Konfession) ist den Polytheistischen Religionen grundsätzlich fremd." This stands in contrast to so-called universal (=monotheistic) religions where Gladigow makes note that:

⁸⁶⁹ The most salient example of this is the example in *Joseph and Aseneth* 15:7, which was cited earlier in the Jewish section. Here confessing the Name (=repenting in the Name) for the expiation of sins is couched in very mythopoetic language, with Repentance depicted as a particularizing manifestation of God who petitions God on behalf of those "who repent in the name of the Most High."

Als Universalreligionen...prophetische Universalreligionen-werden dann Mandaismus, Israelitische Religion, Christentum und Islam aufgeführt; sie alle besäßen...confessorische Formeln, die den 'Wesenkern' der Religion zusammenfassßen.⁸⁷⁰

In a society where a multiplicity of gods was thought to exist, to confess but one god as 'true' is the essential transition point from polytheism to monotheism. I do not go too far in claiming that in some respects confession is a hallmark of monotheistic religions. Such religions formulate their confessions to encapsulate their core beliefs. How striking then, that the earliest Christians could shift the focus from confessing God's name to Jesus (or even Christ)! With these facts in mind, I shall turn now to some particular Christian uses of confession.

One particularly powerful aspect of confessing the name of Christ was that the believer insured his/her salvation. According to Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 3.18) Jesus will confess before God only those who confess his name:

For He promised to confess before His Father those who should confess His name before men; but declared that He would deny those who should deny Him, and would be ashamed of those who should be ashamed to confess Him.

This passage makes clear that confessing the name of Jesus can be a *salvific* act. By confessing Jesus' name the confessor insures that Jesus will acknowledge him/her before God in the eschatological judgement. Given that Jewish piety had always maintained that only the name of God should be confessed, the use of Jesus' name in Christian confession means that Christian confession takes on a powerful christological hue. By confessing Jesus' name one confesses that the name of Jesus is the name which fulfils the promise of Joel 3:5 (LXX).

In conclusion, we can say that confessions, by their very nature, define, organize, and summarize, sacred perceptions and affiliations. Given this truth, the early Christian practice of confessing the very name of Jesus takes on a highly significant *christological* character. Of great interest is that never in my own research did I find an example of this phenomenon directed toward any other mediator figure in Second Temple Judaism. In effect, to confess the name of Jesus (or Christ) is a phenomenon unparalleled in Second Temple Judaism with respect to any other being except God.

⁸⁷⁰ Burkhard Gladigow, "Struktur der Öffentlichkeit und Bekenntnis in Polytheistischen Religionen," in *Secrecy and Concealment*, Studies in the History of Religions # 65, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995): 21-22.

Now in terms of group dynamics, confession binds the community and allows for its cohesion. It is the highest form of religious discourse and distils and linguistically codifies the truth claims of the community. Phenomenologically speaking, it usually finds its home at the very center of the cultus. Indeed, the fact that the early Church confessed the name of Jesus rather than YHWH constitutes an undisputable formal proof that the earliest Christians had taken up a binitarian pattern of cultic devotion in their ritual practices. Indeed, to “confess” the name of Jesus was one mode whereby they *confessed* God.

And, of course, the act of confessing the name of Jesus was a christological act which was as significant in the Christian cult, as confessing the name of God in the Jewish cult. This decisive break from prior Jewish scruples concerning confessing only the name of YHWH demonstrates the christological significance of this phenomenon

III. The name of Jesus in salvific contexts.

‘CALLING ON’ OR INVOKING THE NAME OF JESUS (SALVATION IN THE NAME OF JESUS)

Invocation of the name of Jesus was literally the hallmark of early Christians. Bousset, for one, thought this to be the case when he noted that early Christianity could best be described in the context of how they utilized the name of Jesus. He observes that this use “...ist das Charakteristikum der Christen überhaupt, daß sie den Namen Herrn anrufen.”⁸⁷¹ Heitmüller has added a further note concerning the importance of the practice in terms of our understanding of the Christian cult, he states, “Der Ausdruck ist ungemein bezeichnend und auch für das Verständnis der christlichen Kultusterminologie beachtenswert.”⁸⁷² Examples of this practice abound.

Take for example, the author of Acts, who, in his description of the activities of Paul during his time in persecution of Christians states, “Is this not he who in Jerusalem destroyed those who called on this name, and who had come here for the purpose of bringing them bound before the chief priests?” (Acts 9: 21). Indeed, Ananias, in his petition to the risen Jesus, says of Paul the persecutor, “Lord, I have heard from many about this man, how much harm he did to Thy saints at Jerusalem; and here he has authority from the chief priests to bind all who call upon

⁸⁷¹ Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 85.

⁸⁷² Heitmüller, *INJ*, 213.

Thy name” (Acts 9:13-14). The author furthermore declares in his depiction of the conversion of Paul that Paul is said to have been summoned by Ananias to “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on His name.” Now Paul himself, in I Cor. 1:2, describes the people of God as “...those who have been sanctified in Christ Jesus, saints by calling, with all who in every place call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ...” Another passage which might possibly intimate this practice is the reference to ‘names’ in Acts 18:14-15, where in reference to Jesus’ name the Roman proconsul Gallio says:

If it were a matter of wrong or of vicious crime, O Jews, it would be reasonable for me to put up with you; but if there are questions about words and *names* [emphasis mine] and your own law, look after it yourselves; I am unwilling to be a judge of these matters.

The disputation, which appears to have involved ‘names’, quite possibly is a reference to the controversy about calling upon the name of Jesus for salvation. In any case, we have other examples, such as the later Deutero-Pauline II Tim. 2:19, where Christians are exhorted to abstain from evil and are described as those who “...name the name of the Lord.” I have already indicated the significant passage in Micah 4: 5 where religious conventicles are defined according to the name they invoke or upon which they call. It is clear that the invocation of Jesus’ name lends the early Christian movement its most distinct trait. Given this self-labeling, I need to examine the early Christian movement in light of the influence which invoking the name of Jesus came to have in the development of christology.

The importance of calling upon Jesus’ name for salvation is reflected in Rom. 10:13, where Paul, taking up Joel 2:32, writes that “all those who call upon the name of the Lord will be saved.” In the immediately preceding verses Paul takes up the question of how both Jew and Greek will be saved. In this section, Paul discusses the importance of confession (10:9), as well as the centrality of faith (10: 8), and then Paul crowns this section (e.g. 10:5-13) with the citation of Joel.⁸⁷³ Paul forms this section in order to show by recourse to the Old Testament that Jesus is the goal and fulfillment of the Law (v.4, “Christ is the end of the Law”). Paul’s desire is to show by the scriptures that salvation comes through faith (Isa. 28:16), *and* calling upon the name of the Lord Jesus (Joel 3:5 LXX).⁸⁷⁴

⁸⁷³ Besnard reports that Cerfaux was of the opinion that the reference to Joel in Romans is proof that Paul had received the tradition of the use of Joel from the earliest community and his citation of it here establishes its enduring relevance for Christian thought. See Besnard, *Les Mystère du Nom*, 165.

In Rom. 10:13 the act of calling upon the name of Jesus signifies that Jesus is being acknowledged as the *kyrios*, and it is his name which one must call upon to be saved, in conformity to Joel 3:5 LXX. This linking of Joel 3:5 (LXX) and Jesus' name clearly signals that the earliest Christians felt that God had installed Jesus, and hence his name, as the sole means whereby salvation could be obtained.

This same belief is found again in Acts 4: 5-12, where Peter is brought before the High Priests for healing a man in the name of Jesus. At the end of his defense Peter boldly declares that (v.12) "And there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men, by which we must be saved." This passage is a restatement of Acts 2:21, which quotes Joel to the effect that those who will be saved are those "calling upon the Name of the Lord." In 4:12 we find an explicated version of the Joel-inspired passage of Acts 2:21.

Another passage along these lines is Acts 10:43, where Peter declares that all of the prophets testify to the fact that all who believe in Jesus find forgiveness of their sins "through his name" (διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ).⁸⁷⁵ In the greater context of 38-43 it is verse 42 which provides the key to understanding how the name of Jesus functions here.⁸⁷⁶ In v.42 Jesus is said to have been installed by God as the judge of the living and the dead. This latter expression, 'judge of the living and the dead,' bears closer inspection. This phrase essentially signifies that since Jesus is the judge it is his name which can function as a salvific medium. The author at the end of this section further brings out this sense at 10:48. It is here that Peter commands that the house of Cornelius be baptized in the name of Jesus.

We find a similar, yet fuller passage in I Cor. 6:11, where we read Paul describes his charges in the following manner, "... you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God." Here we find clear

⁸⁷⁴ There can be little doubt that the name in question here is Jesus. Davies has persuasively argued that this reference must refer to Jesus rather than God. For a fuller accounting see, *The Name and Way of the Lord*, 129-130.

⁸⁷⁵ The use of the genitive with διὰ conveys the meaning of medium or agency. See Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner and Friedrich Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 16th ed., (Göttingen, 1984), § 223.3. As quoted in Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 175 fn. 67. Ruck-Schröder does not cite a publisher.

⁸⁷⁶ Ruck-Schröder sees the entire complex of 38-44 as determining the function of the name of Jesus. *DNGJNT*, 175.

echoes of the baptismal rite and the name of Jesus is linked yet again to salvation and forgiveness of sins.

On other fronts, the invocation of the name of Jesus in the Eucharist played a central role by guaranteeing Jesus' presence and authority. Looking at several examples, we find (in the admittedly late) Acts of Thomas (225 C.E.) that the author recites his understanding of the procedure during the Eucharist in his day, "And the apostle standing by it, said: Jesus Christ, Son of God, who hast deemed us worthy to communicate of the Eucharist of Thy sacred body and honorable blood, behold, we are emboldened by the thanksgiving and invocation of Thy sacred name; come now, and communicate with us." Here we see that the name of Jesus was invoked during the performance of the Eucharist, no doubt to secure Jesus' presence during the rite.

An equally instructive example is found in Justin's description of the Eucharist in *I Apol.* 65, where he describes the established protocol in his day in the following manner:

There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands.

We also find, in a Eucharistic framework, the words of Clement of Alexandria where he states in his *Excerpta ex Theodoto* that "The bread and the oil are sanctified by the power (δύναμις) of the Name." The connection between the Eucharist and the name of Jesus again surfaces in the Apostolic Constitutions IV.42, where God, it is said, will use the name of Jesus to "sanctify the oil in the name of the Lord Jesus, and impart to it spiritual grace and efficacious strength, the remission of sins." Therefore, one directed the Eucharist to God, but the name of Jesus was invoked to insure his presence; thus, demonstrating once again the binitarian pattern of early Christian devotion.

What we can conclude from these examples is that in all probability similar invocations using the name of Jesus were used during the Eucharist in the first century and were evidently designed to guarantee the presence of Jesus in the cultic meal.⁸⁷⁷ With these considerations in hand I shall turn to several other particulars.

⁸⁷⁷ All of these examples demonstrate the invocation of the name of Jesus within the Eucharistic setting centers around the epiclesis to God as Daniélou recognized. See Daniélou, *Theology*, 156. Cf. Dom Gregory Dix, *The shape of the liturgy*, (New York : The Seabury Press, 1982; First published January 1945), 218-224.

First, we need to look at the use of the phrase ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα. The significance of this phrase is illustrated by the following considerations. First, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, as we have seen, is a *terminus technicus*; a fact which should signal us that Jesus was being invoked in a fashion that was most commonly afforded to a divinity, and a first century petitioner most certainly would have recognized this fact. It is also worth noting that this expression, when used in the Greek magical papyri to invoke a divinity, is the deponent form ἐπικαλεῖσθαι.⁸⁷⁸

Secondly, Mowinckel notes that cultic acts obtain their power because they are wholly sanctified acts; that is, because they are sanctified they are also powerful.⁸⁷⁹ Clearly, in the context of invocation of Jesus' name, the observation of Heitmüller and the entire History-of-Religions School that the name of the divinity stood as the very foundation of, and had been the most crucial element in, cultic activities has implications for our conclusions.⁸⁸⁰ Simply put, it was the name of the divinity which sanctified the ritual act and the carried the indispensable numen, the ingredient needed to empower the act. And in Christianity the name which carried this power was *Jesus*.

In this regard the statement made by Irenaeus, in his *Ad. Haer.* 2.32.5, has thought-provoking implications. Irenaeus argues that invoking the name of Jesus was qualitatively different from calling upon an angel. No wonders, nor issues of power, were done, he claims, by invoking the angels. Potency resided in the name of Jesus alone. And presumably, as Jesus is now *the* name of power and carries the most *exousia*, it also became a name of cultic import, and thus while there are no cultic settings seemingly appropriate to the invocation of principal agents, this was not the case for the name of Jesus.⁸⁸¹

Concerning the inception of the ritual it seems probable that it was instituted from the earliest period of the Church-almost certainly it began in the primitive Palestinian *Urgemeinde*. Our sources attest to a widespread usage at a relatively early date. This leads one to speculate that the practice must reach back into the earliest period of the Palestinian mother Church. In my

⁸⁷⁸ Heitmüller, *INJ*, 212.

⁸⁷⁹ Mowinckel, *Religion und Kult*, 99.

⁸⁸⁰ Heitmüller, "Namenglauben im NT," 662.

⁸⁸¹ Hurtado, *One God-One Lord*, 83-85. Hurtado makes the useful distinction between simply calling upon or summoning an angelic being for help, and the more pregnant action of positioning Jesus at the center of Christian worship. The former is simply a utilitarian necessity, the latter a breach of normative Jewish religious scruples.

final section of this chapter I shall have more to say on this observation. I shall now press on to review what the invocation of the name of Jesus may have meant.

Having stated the use of invocation to call up the god we need to ask: does the phrase have other connotations? Some commentators, such as Robertson-Plummer, have seen in the phrase the meaning of 'to worship.' This is certainly true in most cases, but if the Book of Acts is to be believed, generally speaking, at first invoking Jesus' name was done with reference to Joel 2: 32 in the sense of calling upon Jesus for protection from the wrath to come. This of course is a cultic act, but whether it constitutes actual worship is more difficult to answer.

Another nuance is the notion of invocation as a confession that Jesus has been raised from the dead and will come again. This belief stems, as I have already noted, from the early Church's interpretation of Joel in the light of the events of Pentecost. Given that the early Church felt that the last days were dawning, we may describe invocation of Jesus as an eschatological act, for Jesus was coming again and this is acknowledged by the act of invocation. Another use is found in liturgical settings. Here the purpose was to celebrate the life and ministry of Jesus, as well as offer worship and thanksgiving.

If we move from strict invocation to the topic of the role of Jesus' name in salvation several passages of note crop up. First is Jn. 20:31, where the author states that he has written his Gospel so that his readers may believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that through this they might have "...life in his name."⁸⁸² This passage forms the end of the original gospel and it summarizes the contents, claims, and goal of the Gospel as a whole.⁸⁸³ Here Jesus' name represents the salvation which came from the ministry and death of Jesus, the 'oneness' of Jesus and God, and the belief of the person in this mission. The author wishes his readers to realize that 'life' (i.e., spiritual life=salvation) is available *through* the name of Jesus.

Yet another passage of relevance is Mt. 12:21, where the author takes up the prophecy of Isaiah 42:1-4 to declare that "In his name the nations will hope." This passage presages Mt. 28: 19, where the nations are commanded to be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The hope of the nations is outlined in verses 18 and 20; that is, they will be excluded from

⁸⁸² Nägelsbach takes this passage to mean that the person belongs to Jesus. This is in keeping with his overall attempt to explain almost all the name statements as signifying possession to Jesus. See, *DNGJHS*, 69.

⁸⁸³ Ruck-Schröder takes the promised life 'in his name' as signifying life in the recognition of who Jesus is; that is, as the *χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, as 20:31 states. See, *DNGJNT*, 208.

the coming κρίσις.⁸⁸⁴ Thus we see once again that Jesus' name is a salvific name; a name that was promised by the prophets.

Another passage which takes up this theme is Lk. 24: 46-47, where the Risen Christ says to his disciples, "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day; 47 and that repentance for forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in His name to all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem." Now Ruck-Schröder takes this passage to mean all the actions which the Apostles will do in the name of Jesus for the promulgation of the Gospel.⁸⁸⁵ In contrast, I take this passage to mean that the name of Jesus is referred to here as representative of the authority of Jesus as the *savior*; that is, the one whose name was to be called upon in order to receive salvation (Acts 2:21), although this does not deny that the passage does look toward Jesus' entire messianic works,⁸⁸⁶ as well as the power which Jesus possesses to bestow eternal life on those who believe (cf. Jn. 1:12). This eternal life comes through the forgiveness of sins in the name of Jesus (Acts 10:43); by calling upon the name of Jesus as well as being baptized in his name (Acts 10: 48). Jesus' name obtains this function for he is the judge of the living and the dead (Acts 10:42). This sense is in good keeping with the claim made in the Johannine Prolog 1:12 that faith in the name of Jesus 'authorizes'⁸⁸⁷ those who believe to become "children of God."

We have seen several passages which echo the sentiment that Jesus' name brought about salvation when it was called upon. This belief has significant implications for christological studies and I shall turn to analyze this material in light of comparative materials.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

The motif of salvation and name is found bound together in the Old Testament in numerous places. In Ps.79:9, for example, the Psalmist states, "Help us O God, our Savior, for the glory of your name; deliver us and forgive our sins for your name's sake." In stark contrast the author of the Book of Acts (4: 12) informs us that "There is salvation in no one else, for there

⁸⁸⁴ Ruck-Schröder, leaning upon Luz, notes that this term cannot mean justice, for this sense is not attested in in profane Greek usage. See, *DNGJNT*, 136 fn. 86.

⁸⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 167.

⁸⁸⁶ *Ibid.* Ruck-Schröder correctly notes that αὐτοῦ points back to τὸν Χριστόν.

⁸⁸⁷ It should be noted that δύναμις is never found in John, only ἐξουσία.

is no other name [Jesus' name] under heaven given among mortals by which we must be saved.” The strong resemblance to the statement in *Joseph and Aseneth* (15:7), where Repentance is depicted as a particularizing manifestation of God who entreats God on behalf of those “who repent in the name of the Most High.” By the illumination shed by this passage Jesus’ name is clearly a salvific name and it is also clear that Jesus’ name has taken over a function reserved solely for God.

This invoking of the name of Jesus is rendered even more remarkable when one considers that Ex. 29:45 (LXX) states that:

And I shall be invoked (ἐπικληθήσομαι) by the sons of Israel and I will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, who brought them forth out of the land of Egypt that I might be invoked by them: I am the Lord their God.

This passage naturally carries with it the notion of covenant. Bound by the Mosaic covenant, Israel could only invoke Yahweh’s name. Furthermore, God for His part, is committed to reveal Himself to those who call upon Him by invoking His name. The invocation of the name of Jesus in the early Church is most striking when viewed in this light. In addition, there are no examples that I am aware of where the names of a principal agent or a patriarch, or any intermediate being, were invoked to bring about salvation. Also, unlike invocation of other Jewish mediator figures, Jesus was invoked in liturgical settings. This is quite different than what was allowed for other figures, who could be called upon to secure immediate physical assistance, but which have not found a place in cultic settings, or to forgive sins.⁸⁸⁸

In the light of this statement Ex. 3:15 bears repeating. God, it is claimed, had revealed His name to Moses and states that He did so that future generations will be able to call upon Him. The passage reads, “God...said to Moses, “Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, ‘The LORD, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you.’ This is My name forever, and this is My memorial-name to all generations.” In a similar vein, Zeph. 3:9 states that “For then I will give to the peoples purified lips, That all of them may call on the name of the LORD, To serve Him shoulder to shoulder.” These passages demonstrate that the invocation of Jesus’ name has strong christological underpinnings. Indeed,

⁸⁸⁸ As McKenzie wrote concerning the difference, “The epiklesis as prayer in the narrow sense is different from the liturgical epiklesis. The god is being called upon to help.” Accordingly, the invocation of angels in times of duress cannot be equated with invoking the name of Jesus in liturgical contexts. This sort of invocation was restricted in Judaism to YHWH alone. See, Peter McKenzie, *The Christians: Their Beliefs and Practices*, (Nashville: Abingdon press, 1988), 161.

Acts 2:32, 38 essentially shelters the petitioners from the coming wrath. It is an eschatological plea for inclusion into the coming Kingdom of God.

Another aspect worth considering is that in the Old Testament the Psalmist could declare at Ps. 124:8 that Israel's help is "...in the name of the Lord." Correspondingly, the claim found at Acts 2:36 is remarkable. No longer is God's name called upon for salvation, but rather Jesus'. This changeover is all the more remarkable when seen in the light of Isa. 12:2-4, where it is said that in the age to come God will dramatically gather the Diaspora Jews together in Israel in one great eschatological act (Isa. 11:6-16). The prophet then says:

Behold, God is my salvation, I will trust and not be afraid;
For the LORD GOD is my strength and song, And He has become my salvation."
3 Therefore you will joyously draw water From the springs of salvation. In that day you will say, "Give thanks to the LORD, call on *His* name [emphasis mine]. Make known His deeds among the peoples; Make them remember that His name is exalted."

These passages highlight various important aspects of Israel's view of God. The first aspect is that God has brought Israel out of Egypt in order to develop a relationship with her, whereby they were to invoke Him. Furthermore, these passages suggest that through the process of invocation the Israelites would see that their God was real and abiding. It was through invocation that one could know that YHWH is the Lord. In this regard Heitmüller was correct when he observed that "Das Rufen des Namens der Gottheit spielt eine Hauptrolle im Kultus, so daß das קרא בשם...den Jahve-Kultus überhaupt bezeichnen kann,"⁸⁸⁹ and Bresnard in his study of invocation has this to say, "Il semble qu'on puisse dire, sans craindre d'exagérer, que toute l'animation transcendante de la religion d'Israël est passée à travers l'invocation du nom de Yahvé."⁸⁹⁰

Given that God had emphasized that the children of Israel would know that He is God through invocation of His name, and since this invocation would demonstrate that He alone is the Lord, this makes the early Christian claim that the name of Jesus was to be used instead of YHWH quite astonishing. Insofar as God's name held pride of place in cultic activities, the reconfiguration of the Christian cult not just to include, but instead emphasize alone, the name of

⁸⁸⁹ Heitmüller, *INJ*, 30.

⁸⁹⁰ Besnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 108.

Jesus signals the birth of a profound christological belief, viz. Jesus was part of the divine identity, however ill defined this notion may have been.

TO HAVE FAITH IN THE NAME OF JESUS

This characteristic Johannine expression is found in Jn. 1:12; 2:23, 3:18 and I Jn. 3:23; 5:13. In I John 3:23, for example, the community is enjoined to have faith in Jesus' name (ἵνα πιστεύσωμεν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) so that they will love one another. Before I tackle the material in the Gospel of John, I shall examine the occurrences of this expression in I John.

In order to emphasize this commandment the author at I Jn. 3:23 places the imperative in the mouth of God; it is He who commands that the community have faith in the name of Jesus. This call to have faith in Jesus' name conveys the notion that the community recognizes the Sonship that Jesus uniquely bears.⁸⁹¹ This faith also calls to mind the concern to reinforce the belief that Jesus has come in the flesh.⁸⁹² Accordingly, in this context, the call to have faith in the Name means also to acknowledge that Jesus has come in the flesh, as God's decisive act of entering into human history in the last days.⁸⁹³ Essentially, the idiom may be rephrased as having faith in Jesus as the Son of God (cf. I Jn. 5:10). Therefore, the function which the name has here is that it is a *symbolon* for Jesus himself.⁸⁹⁴

With respect to the Gospel of John, Untergaßmair has noted that emphasis is placed on Jesus as the revelator of God the Father. Accordingly, those passages which speak of having

⁸⁹¹ So too Smalley, who states that the idiom is just shy of being a confession. For the author the confession would be to believe that Jesus is the Son (2:23; 4:15; 5:5) and the Christ (2:22; 5:1). For more see Stephen S. Smalley, *1, 2, 3, John*, Word Biblical Commentary V.51, (Waco Texas: Word Books, 1984), 207-208.

⁸⁹² Bultmann justly concludes that the idiom is designed to combat the heretical doctrine, which the author is keen to call into question. See Rudolph Bultmann, *A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*, 2nd Ed (originally *Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), ed. Robert W. Funk, Trans. R. Philip O'Hara, Lane C. McGauhy and Robert W. Funk (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), 59.

⁸⁹³ Ibid. Bietenhard too sees that belief on Jesus' name means belief in Jesus' unique Sonship and messianic mission. In addition, through this faith the believer enters into the 'sphere of his person.' See, "ὄνομα," 276.

⁸⁹⁴ Ruck-Schröder, *DNJGNT*, 205-206, 216; Untergaßmair, *I N.J.E.*, 171 and Rudolph Bultmann, *A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*, 59. Bietenhard thinks that the expression means to believe in Jesus' messianic mission and his sonship. I think that initially this expression referred to the belief that Jesus' name was the sole name that one called upon to be saved. Later developments produced what we see here in I John. Of further interest is that Ruck-Schröder, following in the footsteps of R. Brown, makes the claim that belief in the name of Jesus means the belief that Jesus bears the divine name-he is the "Träger des Namens Gottes" [emphasis Ruck-Schröder]. For Bietenhard see, "ὄνομα," 276.

faith in Jesus' name (e.g. 1:12; 2:23; 3:18) mean therefore "Annahme des Sohnes," as the "Offenbarer des Vaters." Another underlying aspect that Untergaßmair detects is that the changing back and forth between the name of the Father and the name of the Son within the Gospel (e.g., for Jesus 1:12; 2:23; 3:18, then the Father, 5:43; 10:25; 12:28, and back to Jesus, 14:26; 15:16, to name just some of the passages) communicates the truth of the Johannine theologoumenon concerning the unity of the Father and the Son (cf. Jn. 10:25-30).⁸⁹⁵ One other interesting note is that those who have faith in the name of Jesus have received the authority (1:12) to become "Children of God" (τέκνα θεοῦ).⁸⁹⁶ Their faith in Jesus (and his name) results in God's gift (ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι) of salvation and *adoption*. Those who have placed their faith in the name of Jesus recognize that Jesus has been sent and authorized by God.⁸⁹⁷ This latter function is similar therefore to the usage in the Epistles. The name is a symbol for Jesus, but it is also a symbol of the truth of the Gospel.

Now one passage in the Gospel of John sounds a clear echo to those passages in Acts which speak of having faith in the name of Jesus in the context of miracles. It is Jn. 2: 23, where the author reports that after performing many miraculous signs the people came to believe on his name. The meaning here I think mirrors what we see in Acts, viz. that belief in the name of Jesus' means believing that his name has been installed by God as the name of power par excellence. In effect, there seems to be a connection drawn between ὄνομα and σημεῖα; that is, "signs" generate a belief in Jesus' ministry and this is expressed by stating that they believe in his name.⁸⁹⁸ The one difference though between John and Acts is that in John these signs are pressed into the service of an explicit programmatic revelatory function.⁸⁹⁹ The name is in this

⁸⁹⁵ Untergaßmair, *I N.J.E.*, 168.

⁸⁹⁶ One last matter is worthy of notice here. Brown observes that 1:12 bears the hallmark of the author and might therefore betray the possibility that the author has added 1:12 into the Logos hymn. If true, the hymn did not bring the author to this belief in Jesus' name. For further details see Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (i-xii)*, The Anchor Bible Commentary, 2nd Ed., (Garden City, New York: Double Day & Company, Inc., 1983, first ed., 1966), 11.

⁸⁹⁷ Ibid., 172.

⁸⁹⁸ Ibid., 173. In connection to John 2:23, Bietenhard avers that the expressions means that the crowds believed in Jesus' messianic mission; that is, they believed in Jesus as the Christ. For further insight from Bietenhard see, "ὄνομα," 276.

⁸⁹⁹ Ibid.

respect like Jesus himself, i.e. Jesus is exalted by God and exists in perfect unity with the Father. So too, the name of Jesus has been exalted and its use has been authorized by God. And the fact that God has raised the name of Jesus to such status attests that Jesus and God exist in complete unity.

Interestingly, in later tradition the expression ‘faith in the name of Jesus’ could be seen to convey the notion that Jesus’ name was numinous, very much as is the case in Acts. One indicator of this emphasis upon the power of the name of Jesus is found in Origen’s brief exhortation to believe on more than just the Name, but also on Jesus himself. The text reads:

Now when he was in Jerusalem at the Passover, during the feast, many believed in his name, beholding his signs which he did.....To this we must add that it was not to those who believed in him that Jesus did not trust, but those who believed on his name; for believing in his name is a different thing from believing in him. ...We must therefore, cleave to him rather than to his name, lest after we have done wonders in his name we should hear these words addressed to us which he will speak to those who boast of his name alone [cf. Mt. 7: 21-23]...Those, on the other hand, of whom we now speak....And as they believe the signs and not in him but in his name, Jesus ‘did not trust them’...⁹⁰⁰

Moving back to John, we find that faith in Jesus’ name plays a recurring role and highlights the importance that this expression had for the author. When we look more closely we find that right after verse 1:12, at 1:14, Jesus is said to be *πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας*. This statement is lifted straight from Ex. 34:6. There it forms a part of the divine predication which are used to reveal to Moses what God is like. This revelation of God’s nature stands in concert with the revelation of God through His name. Therefore, its employment, now in terms of Jesus, signals that Jesus is “die geschichtliche Manifestation des Namens des Gottes Israels.”⁹⁰¹ If this last insight holds then the claim that faith in *Jesus’* name allows one to become a child of God stakes out the further claim that Jesus bears the divine name *in himself* (much like the Angel of the Lord in Exodus). Ruck-Schröder correctly notes that the claim in verse 18, that no one has seen God except “the only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father” generates the correlative claim that only Jesus can reveal the Father, and His name. Just as God revealed His Name in times past, so now Jesus bears this name, and thus, he alone can reveal it to mankind (17:11-12, cf. Jn. 12:44-45; 17:6, 26).

⁹⁰⁰ *Commentary on John*, V.29.

⁹⁰¹ Peter von der Osten-Sacken. As quoted in Ruck-Schröder page 206. For van der Osten Sacken’s work see *Logos als Tora? Anfragen an eine neue Auslegung des Johannesprologs*, H.F. Weiß in Rostock zum 65 Geburtstag, (1994), 145.

Now in 3:18 we find the expression πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. Untergaßmair stresses that the basic meaning here is to be taken as faith in Jesus in his role as the Son, and therefore, the salvific revelator of God.⁹⁰² To unpack this meaning we need to look at the larger context. The passage (3: 18) reads, “He who believes in Him is not judged; he who does not believe has been judged already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.”

As the context makes clear, Jesus has been sent by God as the Son who comes into the world to save it (3:16), while 3:18a makes clear that to have faith in Jesus is the same as believing in his name. Between these hinge passages is verse 17, which portrays Jesus as the Savior sent by the Father for the express purpose of bringing salvation. Thus, believing in Jesus' name is the same as believing in who Jesus is, his role in the divine plan, and his mission.

The situation in I John 5:13 is much the same. The passage reads, “These things I have written to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, in order that you may know that you have eternal life.” The author takes pains to call to mind the facts of the Gospel and to dispel any thought of doubt. Here, too, believing in the name of the Son of God means to believe in the message of Jesus: his ministry, works, and salvation. So then, the name of Jesus here serves to represent Jesus and his message. With the relevant passages covered, it is now time to take up the comparative materials.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

Surprisingly, there are no extant references, save one, so far as I am aware that speak of having faith in God's name. The one place that mentions this expression is I Enoch 67:9, where we read that the ungodly kings will undergo God's punishment because they have denied the Lord of the Spirits and because they “cannot believe in his name.” Although there is but one reference, this review does not end with this observation. If we cast about for comparative material that may offer illumination, one cannot help but draw attention to the fact that to have faith in the name of Jesus is loosely similar to those Old Testaments passages which refer to the name of YHHW as an object of reverence and fear (Deut. 28:58,60, Neh. 1:11; Ps. 33:21; cf. Rev. 11:18).⁹⁰³

⁹⁰² Untergaßmair, *I NJJE*, 171-172. By extension, as Untergaßmair notes, is the belief in Jesus' claim to be the one who reveals God, a position which results in faith in Jesus' Sonship.

Another possible point of contact with Old Testament conceptions is that faith in the name of Jesus recalls Ps. 124:8, which expresses faith that Israel's help was to be found in the name of God.

Here the belief in God's name is another way of saying that they have faith in God Himself. As is so often the case, the Name serves to represent God. In like manner, the name of Jesus represents Jesus: his person, work, and ministry as the supreme revelator of God.⁹⁰⁴

COMMAND OR ADMONISH SOMEONE IN THE NAME OF JESUS

This expression is found in II. Thess. 3:6, where we read:

Now we command you (Παραγγέλλομεν δὲ ὑμῖν), brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ (ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), that you keep aloof from every brother who leads an unruly life and not according to the tradition which you received from us.

In order to unpack the function of the name of Jesus in this passage it should be noted that an almost identical form of admonishment is found in v.12, where the author states that he is commanding and exhorting "in the Lord Jesus Christ." This second verse makes it clear that the name of Jesus in 3:6 is really a symbol for Jesus himself, and correspondingly, for his authority over the Body of Christ.⁹⁰⁵

The function, therefore, of the name of Jesus is clearly that it serves as the symbol for the authority of Jesus, as well as an acknowledgement that this name is the name of the Lord (=a name of power and authority).⁹⁰⁶ In addition, the verse relates also to the recognition between the author and his audience that Jesus is their common Lord.⁹⁰⁷ Part of this recognition led to the recollection on the part of the author for his readers that their inclusion in the faith was

⁹⁰³ Nägelsbach, *DNGJHS*, 58.

⁹⁰⁴ Regrettably I know of no Greco-Roman materials that evidence this usage.

⁹⁰⁵ Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 103. Put in other terms, the Apostles' authority derives from Jesus. As Bruce has pointed out. See F.F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, V, 45, Word Biblical Commentary, (Waco Texas: Word Books, 1982), 204. Bietenhard adds that the name of Jesus functions as Paul's authorization for his authority. See, "ὄνομα," 278.

⁹⁰⁶ So too, Wolfgang Trilling, *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher Band XIV*, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, eds. Josef Blank, Rudolf Schnackenburg, Eduard Schweizer, and Ulrich Wilkens, (Zürich, Einsiedeln, and Köln: Benziger Verlag and Neukirchener Verlag, 1980), 143.

⁹⁰⁷ Dellling, *Die Zueignung*, 55 fn. 192 and Heitmüller, *INJ*, 73. This acknowledgement of the Lordship of Christ is also seen in I Thess. 4:1. Like II Thess. 3:6 we find the use of *διδ* in a fashion which suggests a relationship to Jesus' Lordship. See Dellling's observations on pg. 55.

predicated on their ‘belonging’ to Jesus.⁹⁰⁸

Although II Thess. 3:16 is perhaps the most oft-cited passage as an example of this type of action in Jesus’ name, we find this expression again in I Cor. 1:10, where Paul admonishes his readers to unity “in the name of our Lord Jesus (Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).

Paul hopes to appeal to the Corinthian believers to come together as one. This appeal presages the very troublesome issues which Paul will be forced to address next (i.e., the schisms described in 1:11-17). Paul uses the name of Jesus to call them to remember that they are all members of one body and one faith, baptized under one name.⁹⁰⁹ The word Παρακαλῶ in this passage precedes the genitive construction which begins with διὰ, and this signifies that διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ should be rendered with, ‘by means of,’ and signifies more agent than instrument.⁹¹⁰ In this sense it is fair to say that the name of Jesus represents Jesus himself. Thus, to admonish someone in the name of Jesus is fundamentally the same as if someone admonished another person *in Jesus*; that is, by appealing to Jesus’ authority and Lordship over both parties.⁹¹¹

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

There are, to the best of my knowledge, no examples which parallel this use, either in the Jewish literature, or in the Greco-Roman literature that I am familiar with. Still, some clues have been left for us in this literature which will help to gain some measure of understanding.

First of all, we know already that the name of a divinity could be used to command other spiritual beings. No less dependent on the notion of authority in the world of that day, the name

⁹⁰⁸ Nägelsbach, *DNGJHS*, 68.

⁹⁰⁹ Pace Steyn, who believes that this carries the sense that Paul’s appeal is predicated upon the reality that the use of the name of Jesus meant that Jesus was present. I think that here it is a *symbolon* for Jesus himself, their shared faith, and their allegiance to one Lord: Jesus Christ. For Steyn see, “To Onoma tou Kyriou in I Cor.,” 485.

⁹¹⁰ Steyn, *Ibid.*, 484.

⁹¹¹ Kramer, in my opinion incorrectly, sees not only the aspect of belonging to Jesus, but also an *Anrufung* of the Name. I think this highly unlikely and think the context makes clear that Paul is appealing to Jesus as their common Lord; the common point of reference and authority for the Church. For Kramer’s views see, *Christos, Kurios, Gottessohn*, 75.

of Caesar could be used to represent Caesar.⁹¹² Hence, one could command another person to do the bidding of Caesar by invoking his name as a symbol for the authority of the person (who is deputized so to speak to act on Caesar's behalf). In the case of the divine, the power of a divine name to compel another god or demon was tied to the power and authority of the god. In the second case, that of Caesar's name, a similar circumstance exists. Caesar's name carried with it the authority and power which Caesar possessed. Thus, Caesar's name represented Caesar himself. In a similar fashion, the name of Jesus stands as his representative; that is, it represents his authority and power over the church. As the Risen Lord and the sole bearer of salvation, Jesus was the head of the church and her ultimate authority.

SUFFERING FOR THE SAKE OF THE NAME OF JESUS

This motif is exemplified at various places in the New Testament (e.g. Mk. 13:13; Lk. 21:12, 17; Acts 5:41; 9:16; 15:26; 21:13; I Peter 4:14, 16; Jn. 15:21; Rev. 2:3; 13:17; 20:4). With respect to references to suffering within Acts, numerous passages, specifically 5:41, 9:16, 15:26, and 21:13, all make clear that the sufferings were, or would be, engendered by actions relating to the propagation of the Gospel. Accordingly, suffering for the name of Jesus means, in the context of Acts at least, not just suffering because one holds to the Christian faith but also, or even rather, that one suffers for carrying out missionary endeavors.⁹¹³ Taking a closer look at 5:41 the narrative reports that the Apostles were joyous about their suffering for the name of Jesus (5:41) and clearly the Apostles embrace this suffering for the name's sake, for it is this name which they call upon for salvation (Acts 4:12), and it is the name into which they were baptized.

A related expression is found at Acts 9:15, concerning Paul's mission. It is claimed that Jesus says to Ananias concerning Paul:

[He] Is a chosen instrument of Mine, to bear My name before the Gentiles and kings and the sons of Israel (τοῦ βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐνώπιον ἐθνῶν τε καὶ βασιλέων

⁹¹² E.g. Philo *On the Virtues* V.42, "And though they [a mob which had come to Flaccus] knew this (for they are very shrewd in their wickedness), they adopted a deep design, putting forth the name of Caesar as a screen, to whom it would be impiety to attribute the deeds of the guilty." Also Josephus in *AJ* 16.10.8, where the name of Caesar represents Caesar in a case of profanation, on a matter of the actions of Nicholas in Arabia, "And this is all the war which these men so tragically describe; and this is the affair of the expedition into Arabia. And how can this be called a war, when thy presidents permitted it, the covenants allowed it, and it was not executed till thy name, O Caesar, as well as that of the other gods, had been profaned?"

⁹¹³ Similarly Ziesler, "The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles," 36.

υἱῶν τε Ἰσραήλ); 16 for I will show him how much he must suffer for My name's sake (ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος μου παθεῖν).⁹¹⁴

Decisive for the understanding of this expression is the meaning assigned to it by G. Lohfink's study. He has shown that the expression "To bear My name" refers to suffering for the sake of the Gospel and carries with it the notion of public confession.⁹¹⁵ Lohfink also shows that ἐνώπιον bears the nuance of a public showing,⁹¹⁶ while the word βαστάζειν has clear Greco-Roman, as well as early Christian parallels. For example, in the Similitudes of the Shepherd of Hermas (IX 28.5) we find a clear connection between the expression and suffering.⁹¹⁷ Lohfink also makes the interesting observation that the claim that Paul would bear the Name before βασιλέων conflicts with the interpretation that we are dealing with Paul's missionary endeavors.⁹¹⁸ Thus, it must mean that Paul would give a public showing of his faith before hostile Roman magistrates and Jewish kings.

Now according to I Peter 4:14-16 it is the person who suffers for the faith (represented as suffering for the name "Christian"), who can then glorify God through the bearing of the name 'Christian.'⁹¹⁹ The author writes, "If you are reviled for the name of Christ, you are blessed, because the Spirit of glory and of God rests upon you...but if anyone suffers as a Christian, let him not feel ashamed, but in that name let him glorify God." Here, the name of Christ represents both Jesus and the Christian faith. Although this text refers to Christ rather than Jesus, the notion of suffering for the Christian faith, as symbolized by a name, is nonetheless of some passing note.

⁹¹⁴ We find this phrase again in Rev. 2:3 where the Ephesian Christians are described as those who, ἐβάστασας διὰ τὸ ὄνομα μου. The community suffers because their confession of Christ differs from that of the false apostles. To describe the source of the conflict Ruck-Schröder suggests the expression "im Sinne ihres Christusverständnisses." See *DNGJNT*, 243.

⁹¹⁵ Gerhard Lohfink, "»Meinen Namen zu tragen... « (Apg 9,15)," in *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände 5, eds. Gerhard Dautzenberg and Norbert Lohfink, (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990), 213-221.

⁹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 215.

⁹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 216.

⁹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 217. Clearly, if Paul's mission were in view then the term βασιλέων is inappropriate.

⁹¹⁹ Correctly Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 240.

Naturally, this suffering is in keeping with the suffering that Jesus himself had undergone (I Peter 4:13). This shared experience of suffering allows the Christian to join with Christ through these sufferings. Furthermore, suffering for the Name signifies adherence to the truth of the Gospel and the refusal to yield to those who would contest its truth. Of course, this also signifies that the person belongs to Christ as only they will have the conviction to endure until the end.⁹²⁰ It also signifies that those who suffer for the name of Christ can expect the presence of the Holy Spirit, as verse 14b makes clear.

In Mark 13:13 we read of Jesus speaking of those who are faithful as suffering διὰ τὸ ὄνομα μου. It is clear from v.13b that Jesus is referring to those who will endure to the very end. These are the ones who shall receive the promised salvation this is spoken of at the end of v. 13b. In any event, we should read all of these passages in light of the fact that the theme of suffering and rejection is a central element of apocalyptic thought. Thus, suffering for the Name is received by the readers as an eschatological event, and in accordance with their faithfulness they will receive the promise of salvation when the Last Days has come to its end.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

Regarding the suffering that is done for being a Christian, it is directly analogous, as we have just seen, to the Jewish theme of suffering for the sake of God.⁹²¹ Jewish martyrology is replete with numerous legends and stories about the willingness of many Jews to suffer for the sake of their faith. We have seen in the section on confession in Jewish circles that Jews sometimes suffered extreme penalties for holding too rigidly to their religious convictions. Here, Josephus' words are worth repeating. In the *Bellum Judaicum* (7.417-418) Josephus mentions the Jewish refusal to acknowledge Caesar as Lord. This refusal led to many physical trials. Josephus described the courage of those who suffered in the following fashion:

Whose courage, or whether we ought to call it madness, or hardness in their opinions, everybody was amazed at; (418) for when all sorts of torments and vexations of their

⁹²⁰ Correctly, Nägelsbach, *DNGJHS*, 67.

⁹²¹ Although the Jewish literature prior to the Christian era contains no true analog to the New Testament expression, the notion is not at all foreign to pre-Christian Jews. Suffering for God is in fact the same as suffering for His name. Ruck-Schröder quotes in this context the interesting summation of Graubard from his essay, "Das 'Kaddish'-Gebet," in which he states that "Seit R. Akibas Martyrium war der Tod für die Heiligung des göttlichen Namens eine Krönung des Lebens, die Erfüllung des höchsten Gebotes der Gottesliebe." Although the Rabbis stem from a later period, the concept of suffering for God reaches back centuries prior to the Christian era. For Ruck-Schröder see, *DNGJNT*, 191, fn.145. For Graubard see, "Das >Kaddish<-Gebet," in *Das Vaterunser. Gemeinsames im Beten von Juden und Christen*, 3rd ed., ed. M. Brocke, (Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1990), 116.

bodies that could be devised were made...they could not get anyone of them to comply so far as to confess or seem to confess, that Caesar was their lord; but they preserved their own opinion, in spite of all the distress they were brought to, as if they received these torments and the fire itself with bodies insensible of pain, and with a soul that in a manner rejoiced under them.

In a similar manner, Christians were willing to endure sufferings for their faith. Naturally, the whole notion of suffering for one's faith was not unknown in Greco-Roman circles either. Although living at a time of impressive syncretistic impulse some faiths were less popular than others and many suffered the consequences. One of the better known examples is the prohibition of some magical practices, such as the *Lex Cornelia de Sicariis et Veneficiis* (81 B.C.E.). Following this edict numerous magicians were rounded up and the Roman officials meted out severe punishment.⁹²² Clearly, persecution for 'Jesus' name' reflects a common experience among Christians, although the Christian (and Jewish) persecution is distinguished from what we know of persecutions of adherents of various Greco-Roman cults in that Christian and Jewish persecution was engendered by refusal to acknowledge the Greco-Roman gods.

As for the significance of this willingness to suffer for Christ it must be pointed out that this suffering has a christological component to it; that is, Christians suffer for *Jesus' name* (=Jesus and his message). Obviously, the earliest Christians believed that Jesus bore a message and revelation that was worth suffering for. In essence, Christians believed that Jesus was the Savior and Lord, whose person and mission cleared the only path to God.

THANKS OFFERED TO GOD IN THE NAME OF JESUS

In Eph. 5: 20 the author admonishes his readers to always give thanks to God "...in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." This admonition harkens back to 5:4, where the author instructs his readers that as a holy people no unseemly language should be found among them, "but rather thanksgiving." A similar admonishment is expressed in the immediately preceding verse where the author admonishes his readers to sing songs and hymns to the Lord⁹²³ (λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς [ἐν] ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς), and also "giving thanks to God the Father at all times and for everything in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." (cf. Col. 3:16f.).⁹²⁴

⁹²² For further details see C.R. Phillips III, "Nullum Crimen sine Lege: Socioreligious Sanctions on Magic," in *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, eds. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink, (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 260-276.

⁹²³ It is uncertain whether the term *kyrios* refers to God or Jesus.

These spiritual songs were made possible because the readers were filled with the Spirit (5:18). Of great importance is that the passage carries the notion that Jesus is the mediator between God and man; thus, it is he who is the mediator of the thanksgiving.⁹²⁵ This role as mediator is here the same as we have seen in the case of prayer offered to God in Jesus' name. In both cases, Jesus is the mediator between God and man (cf. Heb. 7:25; Rom. 8:34). The author has indeed already employed this concept at 2:13, where the author speaks of being drawn close to God in the following terms: *νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. This thought of mediation by Jesus to God in Eph. 5:20 does not escape the notice of Paul himself in Rom. 7:25, where Jesus is the reference for the act of thanksgiving to God.⁹²⁶ Moreover, Eph. 5:20 sounds clear echoes of Col. 3:17, where the Deutero-Paulinist author exhorts his readers to do all in the name of Jesus, as well as give thanks to God *through* Jesus.⁹²⁷

Now this action clearly takes place with reference to Jesus, and to his position as the sole mediator between God and man.⁹²⁸ This concept of Jesus as the mediator between God and man leads us to the supposition that the early Christian communities held the conviction that ritual acts, such as prayer, thanksgiving, praise, were acceptable to God only when they are offered

⁹²⁴ Lincoln notes that the word *πνευματικάς*, although agreeing only with *ψαλμοῖς* in gender, relates to all three terms. See Andrew Lincoln, *Ephesians*, Word Biblical Commentary V. 42, (Dallas TX.: Word Books, 1990), 345-46. Ruck-Schröder believes, and I concur, that the name of Jesus was spoken out during these ritual performances, even if it turns out the word *κυρίῳ* applies to God. See Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 100.

⁹²⁵ Ruck-Schröder, *Ibid.*, 101. So too Heitmüller, although he also adds that the expression additionally means that the name of Jesus is 'named' during the actions of the verbs because it is the go-between for mankind and God. See, *INJ*, 262. Nägelsbach however, thinks the passage means that the believer belongs to Jesus. See, *DNGJHS*, 71.

⁹²⁶ "Thanks be to God-through Jesus Christ our Lord."

⁹²⁷ The features of similarity are that both Col. 3:17 and Eph. 5:20 speak of, *ψαλμοῖς ὕμνοις ψαλμοῖς πνευματικάς*, and both passages speak of giving thanks to God, while also containing an exhortation to perform some action in the name of Jesus.

⁹²⁸ Correctly Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 100. Delling though thinks otherwise. He contends that the expression attests to an "*um seinetwillen*" function on behalf of Jesus. He points to Rom. 1:8 and 7:25 ("I thank God through Jesus Christ...") to support his view. These passages seem to me to indicate rather a mediating function (see Rom. 8:34) on the part of Jesus-and hence his name too. See *Die Zueignung*, 53.

through Jesus. Accordingly, the use of the name of Jesus to thank God signifies the acknowledgement of this unique mediating position, which God had conferred upon Jesus.⁹²⁹

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

Not surprisingly, the unique position allotted to Jesus as the mediator between God and man is largely unparalleled in Jewish literature. It is true that at times angels were thought to ‘carry’ prayers to God, but this is not ‘true’ mediation.⁹³⁰ This role is more along the lines of service to God’s people. In contrast, ‘thanksgiving’ to God *through* another person or spiritual being is not attested in our sources. Of course, the absence of the use of God’s name makes some sense here, i.e., God’s people could thank Him directly and do not need to use His name. In contrast, Jesus is a historical figure who brought a unique experience of God. This experience, coupled with the belief that Jesus anchored the entire salvific drama in his person, led the earliest Christians to think that Jesus, and Jesus alone, could mediate offerings, prayers, and holy acts, to God. Correspondingly, ‘thanksgiving’ to God through Jesus’ name serves as evidence that Jesus was seen as the sole mediator between God and man.

GLORIFYING (PRAISING) THE NAME OF JESUS

This use of the name of Jesus is attested to in II Thess. 1:10-12:

When He [Jesus] comes to be glorified in His saints on that day, and to be marveled at among all who have believed—for our testimony to you was believed. 11 To this end also we pray for you always that our God may count you worthy of your calling, and fulfill every desire for goodness and the work of faith with power; 12 *in order that the name of our Lord Jesus may be glorified in you* [emphasis mine], and you in Him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ

The first thing to be noted is that this passage would appear to contain a faint echo of Isa. 66:5. Here in the latter half of the verse we read the admonishment, “Let the LORD be glorified, that we may see your joy.” The observation that this may be a possible allusion to Isa. 66:5 is strengthened by the fact that Paul has just drawn upon Isa. 66:15 at verse eight. Critical to understanding this whole section is its tenor: it is thoroughly colored by eschatological

⁹²⁹ Another aspect which should be raised is that this thanksgiving to God through the name of Jesus is made possible through the actions of the Holy Spirit (Eph. 5:18). See Ruck-Schröder, *DNJGNT*, 101.

⁹³⁰ Likewise, Hermes was thought capable of carrying messages between the gods and humans. Again, this role is one of service and not mediation in its truest sense.

expectations.⁹³¹ This backdrop makes the meaning clear; by carrying out their faith in reference to the Lordship of Jesus, which will be demonstrated and confirmed at the Parousia, Jesus will be glorified by what he has accomplished in the believer.⁹³² Thus, the name of Jesus and Jesus' eschatological glory (accomplished through his ministry and later lordship) are equated here.⁹³³

Another passage which picks up this theme, albeit in a slightly different sense, is Acts 19:17. After the events of the Seven Sons of Sceva, the city of Ephesus is claimed to have undergone an amazing transformation in light of the events depicted in 19: 11-16. This transformation included a new respect for the name of Jesus. Acts 19:17 reads:

And this became known to all [the events surrounding the Seven Sons of Sceva], both Jews and Greeks, who lived in Ephesus; and fear fell upon them all and the name of the Lord Jesus was being magnified.

It is clear from the remarkable events at Ephesus that Jesus' name was now recognized as a name of power; perhaps even *the* preeminent name of power among some in Ephesus. People were now 'magnifying' (=glorifying) the name of Jesus as a name of a divine being. This magnifying attests to the fact that many Ephesians now had faith in the name of Jesus; that is, they now believed that his name was laden with numinous and apotropaic power.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

In terms of Greco-Roman conventions the statement that Jesus' name is to be glorified recalls those places in the *PGM* that speak of 'hymning' or 'glorifying' the name of the deity (e.g., XXXVI.165-170, where the magician is "glorifying" the "sacred and honored names which are in heaven"; XII.256-257, which speaks of the angels 'hymning' the name of the god and XXI.18 [cf. XIII 788-789], where the Muses 'praise' the glorious 'name'). As in the case of the New Testament, the devotees were concerned to bring glory to the deity by glorifying the name of the god or goddess. Of particular relevance is *PGM* VII.496-500, where in a summons of Isis a supplicant prays and says that he will glorify the name of the son of the gods:

⁹³¹ See Ernest Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1972), 271.

⁹³² So too E. Best. *Ibid.*

⁹³³ F.F. Bruce believes the connection to be one of name and reputation in the present situation of the readers. Bruce relies upon a present ethical emphasis, but clearly, given the broader eschatological context, Best is to be preferred here. For Bruce see, F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 156.

Protect me, great and marvelous names of the [gods]...Protect me, great and marvelous names of the great god,...glorify me, as I have glorified the name [ἐδόξασα τὸ ὄνομα] of your son Horus...

As the examples from the *PGM* demonstrate, divine names were thought to be worthy of glory, honor, praise, and ‘hymning.’ In the illumination cast by the *PGM* it seems reasonable to assume that a hint of this same belief must have suggested itself to Gentile-Christians who heard, or used, these expressions with respect to the name of Jesus. Certainly, this chorus of examples compare favorably with the examples cited from the New Testament.

Now we have already seen in the section on the Jewish practice of praising the name of God that the Israelites were encouraged to honor the Name by praising it. We also observed that several passages make an association between the praise of God and His Name; establishing in effect that the Name served as a surrogate for God Himself. The Israelite often combined this praise with a recounting of the glorious deeds of God. The context, in its broadest scope, is one of *cultic* praise of God and His name in the congregation. But how does this cultic practice impact our understanding of the early Christian practice of ‘praising’ the name of Jesus?

As Bietenhard has already pointed out, even as it was the concern of the Old Testament piety to glorify the name of God, in the new covenant the focus had shifted to glorifying the name of Jesus.⁹³⁴ This glorification was thought to be acceptable because God Himself had installed Jesus as the Lord over the cosmos. This exaltation was so robust and singular that many in the early Church were led to the conclusion that Jesus was part of the divine identity. As the historical manifestation of the divine reality, Jesus, and his name, were believed to be worthy of praise. It is worth noting that in terms of Judaism I am unaware of any examples where the names of angels, or other intermediary beings, receive cultic praise. Jesus’ name, as is so often the case, is singular.

PRAYER IN THE NAME OF JESUS

To begin, we need to observe that the act of praying in Jesus’ name is a more complex phenomenon than it would at first seem, and this has divided scholars on the meaning of the phrase. According to Nägelsbach this phrase means nothing more than the fact that the petitioner stands before God as someone who is the possession of Jesus.⁹³⁵ Others would insist that at first

⁹³⁴ Bietenhard, “ὄνομα,” 274.

instinct we should think of invocation when we hear of prayer in Jesus' name. Still others insist that the phrase should be understood as signifying that prayer is offered in Jesus' name because he is acknowledged as "den Heilsbringer, den Offenbarer."⁹³⁶ In order to ascertain what is meant by this phrase we will need to look at various places in the New Testament where it occurs.

Examples of this phraseology are most numerous in the Gospel of John (14:13; 15:16; 16:23, 26f).⁹³⁷ The first to be examined is 16:23, and the second is 16:26f. I quote them both here:

And in that day you will ask Me no question. Truly, truly, I say to you, if you shall ask the Father for anything, He will give it to you in My name.

And,

In that day you will ask in My name, and I do not say to you that I will request the Father on your behalf; for the Father Himself loves you, because you have loved Me, and have believed that I came forth from the Father.

In these passages the name of Jesus functions, not so much a numinous agent, but as the symbol for the "Offenbarungswerk" of Jesus.⁹³⁸ Beyond this, these two passages are designed to strongly underscore the unity between God, Jesus, and the followers of Jesus.⁹³⁹ This relationship permits the intentions of God to become concrete actions on behalf of His children when they pray in the name of Jesus. This unity is seen in that God answers prayers when they are performed *in Jesus' name*.

Now in terms of Jn. 14:13-14 we find that it is Jesus who says that he will fulfill the prayer request. The passage reads:

And whatever you ask in My name, that will I do (καὶ ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου τοῦτο ποιήσω), that the Father may be glorified in the Son 14 If you ask Me anything in My name, I will do it.

⁹³⁵ Nägelsbach, *DNGJHS*, 72.

⁹³⁶ So Delling. See *Die Zueignung*, 58. Bietenhard, when addressing the meaning of the phrase in John's Gospel, comes to the conclusion that prayer in Jesus' name translates into the belief that Jesus has "come forth from God;" and that Jesus is "God's Son," for whom God will answer prayer. See, "ὄνομα," 276.

⁹³⁷ Here the word is always some form of αἰτεῖν. Prayer is however a perfectly acceptable translation. See Baur, Walter, William Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, "αἰτέω," in *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd ed. (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 25-26.

⁹³⁸ Untergaßmair's expression. See, *INJJE*, 236. Nägelsbach contends, as always, that these passages carry the notion of simply belonging to Jesus. See *DNGJHS*, 72.

⁹³⁹ Delling, *Die Zueignung*, 58-59 and Untergaßmair, *INJJE*, 239.

Several observations are in order. First, this section (14:7-15) revolves around the concern to establish one issue; namely, the unity between Jesus and God.⁹⁴⁰ It is therefore interesting to observe that 14:13-14, with its emphasis on Jesus' promise to fulfill the request, has a strong christological coloring. Indeed, Jesus' promise to fulfill the requests is yet another extension of Jesus' revelatory work (14:9; cf. 14:6) of glorifying the Father ("that the Father may be glorified in the Son").⁹⁴¹ Both aspects; that of glorifying the Father, as well as revealing the Father, form the core of the author's christology throughout the Gospel, and it is this christological focus which fuels the claim found in 14:13-14.

Another concern of the author is seen in verse 12; that is, to assure the disciples that they will also do even greater works than Jesus ("Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes in Me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to the Father"; cf. Mt 21:22; Mk 11:24; Lk. 11:9; James 1:6). Here, the thought does not lie in the direction of the numinosity of the name itself, but rather that the works are an outgrowth of faith in Jesus,⁹⁴² as well as a product of the 'oneness' of Jesus and the Father (14: 10-11):

Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me? The words that I say to you I do not speak on My own initiative, but the Father abiding in Me does His works. 11 "Believe Me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me; otherwise believe on account of the works themselves"⁹⁴³

Of course, the unity between Jesus and God, must also by necessity extend to the disciples and Jesus.⁹⁴⁴ In any case, unlike what we are used to seeing in the Book of Acts, in the

⁹⁴⁰ Untergaßmair, *INJJE*, 161.

⁹⁴¹ Ibid., 161, 119. Essentially, what the author is attempting to establish is that just as the earthly Jesus revealed the glory of the Father (11:40; cf. 17:1, 4), so too will the 'heavenly' Jesus continue this work. In point of fact, it is clear throughout the Gospel (esp. chapter 17) that Jesus is acting in this capacity on the commission of God. Of additional significance is that the promised fulfillment by Jesus (τοῦτο ποιήσω) relates to, indeed it is subordinate, to the following ἵνα-clause of glorifying the Father (ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατήρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ).

⁹⁴² Ibid., 117. Untergaßmair rightly notes that verse 12 does not say, "You will do works etc.," but rather that, "he who *believes in Me* [emphasis mine], the works that I do shall he do also; and greater *works* than these shall he do; because I go to the Father." This verse then justly emphasizes the correlation between faith in Jesus and the ability to carry out the revelatory work of Jesus.

⁹⁴³ Ibid., 114-116. Untergaßmair observes that the statement in 12b, that Jesus returns to the Father, carries with it some consequences. One of these consequences is that while Jesus has gone to the Father, the disciples now carry on the revelatory work which Jesus began. Another consequence is that because Jesus will be with the Father, the revelatory work will be expanded.

⁹⁴⁴ Ibid., 113. See Untergaßmair's discussion.

Gospel of John we do not see any overt concern to emphasize the numinous nature of the name of Jesus and supernatural events. Here the focus is solely upon the christological program of the author, viz. that Jesus is the revelator of the Father to mankind, and that Jesus and the Father are 'one.'

We perhaps catch a further glimpse of this 'oneness' when we turn to the Johannine passage of Jn. 12:28, where Jesus says "Father, Glorify your Name" and the passage of Jn. 17:1, where Jesus also says, "Father, Glorify your Son." The parallelism can perhaps be taken to imply more than a literary relationship; instead it intimates that a parallel reality is being underscored; that is, Jesus the Son is the name of God.⁹⁴⁵ Indeed, just as Jesus is the Word (logos) of God (Jn. 1:1), so too is he the name of God incarnate. In part, Jesus assumes this role because his ministry and his work takes on the same functions that the divine name had in the O.T.⁹⁴⁶

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

In terms of direct Jewish parallels there are no examples that I am aware of in the Old Testament that speaks of prayer in God's name (although surely prayer must have been performed in God's name).⁹⁴⁷ We do find numerous examples of the use of the name of God in healings and the like. As for the christological significance of the early Christian practice we need look no further than Colin Brown's suggestion that Phil. 2:9-10 must be taken to imply that all creation must now approach God *through* the name of Jesus.⁹⁴⁸ I think that Brown's understanding offers not only great promise for understanding the use of the name of Jesus in a mediation context, but also the origin for such use. If Brown is right, then it is clear that the earliest Christians believed that they *must* use the name of Jesus to reach God, because God had authorized this name alone as the medium whereby God and man could come together.

⁹⁴⁵ Bresnard, *Le Mystère du Nom*, 178.

⁹⁴⁶ Ibid., 182.

⁹⁴⁷ We should remember what Untergaßmair has pointed out, viz. that the sole unambiguous *cultic* use of the name of YHWH in the Old Testament with respect to *prayer* is found at Ps. 63:4. As already noted, in this Psalm of praise the Psalmist says, "So I will bless Thee as long as I live; I will lift up my hands in Thy name (BHS 63:5; מְשַׁבְּחֶךָ). See, Untergaßmair, *INJJE*, 237 fn. 156.

⁹⁴⁸ Colin Brown, "Ernst Lohmeyer's *Kyrios Jesus*," 16. Delling adopts a contrary position. He argues that prayer is answered on an "*um seinetwillen*" (for Jesus' sake) basis. I think that this is following the wrong track. Brown is more on the mark and we must reckon with the notion that Jesus' salvific work, and subsequent exaltation, placed his name in the ultimate mediatory position. In any case, for Delling's views see *Die Zueignung*, 59.

TO COME IN THE NAME OF JESUS

At Mark 13:5-6, Jesus, when speaking of the events that will transpire in the last days says that “See to it that no one misleads you. Many will come in My name (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι), saying, ‘I am *He!*’ and will mislead many.” Jesus is here referring to the numerous (πολλοί) false prophets and false apostles which were to come (v.21-23). Just who these false prophets and false apostles may have been need not concern us here. Nor do I need to delve into the various ways of understanding the ἐγὼ εἰμι phrase.⁹⁴⁹ Instead, I need to deal only with how the use of the name of Jesus functions in this passage. Here, it seems to me, the name clearly functions as the source for their claim to have the authority of Jesus and the legitimating of their mission.⁹⁵⁰ That is, the name symbolizes the authority of Jesus himself (see discussion below for examples of this meaning in contemporary non-Christian texts). Thus, their authority and position is established by reference to the name of Jesus.

Now in contrast to Mark, Matthew adds ὁ χριστός at 24:5, and clearly signals that he sees the imposters as false Christ’s. These false Christ’s use the name of Jesus to establish their claim as legitimate.⁹⁵¹ That is, they claim that they come in the commission of Jesus, a claim that they try to establish by saying that they come in Jesus’ name. Matthew also sees these imposters as performing their exorcisms and miracles on the authority of Jesus, which is symbolized by his name (e.g., Matt. 24: 23-25). Matthew also believes that the false prophets will perform their miracles by using Jesus’ name as is made clear by 7:15- 22. It reads:

Beware of the false prophets, who come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly are ravenous wolves...19 “Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. 20 “So then, you will know them by their fruits. 21 “Not everyone who says to Me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven; but he who does the will of My Father who is in heaven. 22 “Many will say to Me on that day, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in Your name, and in Your name cast out demons, and in Your name perform many miracles?’

Here it is clear that the name of Jesus would be used by these false prophets to perform wonders.

⁹⁴⁹ Most commentators see here a reference to an imposter, who is claiming to be Jesus *redivivus*. Other exegetes see instead a direct taking up of an *Offenbarungsformel* which would certify the imposter as the proper divine revelator. Ruck-Schröder offers the suggestion that the phrase is a claim to be the returning Christ at the promised Parousia. Yet another possibility is that Christian prophets were going around in an apocalyptic guise and proclaiming their authority. A possible indication in this direction is that the following section, v. 9-13, is clearly set in an apocalyptic context. For a fuller exposition on these matters see Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 110-112.

⁹⁵⁰ Ibid., 109-110.

⁹⁵¹ Ibid., 112.

Not to be outdone, Luke also fashions the Marcan pericope to his own ends. In 21:8 Luke makes it clear that those who will come in the name of Jesus will come during the supreme eschatological moment. The author writes, “See to it that you be not misled; for many will come in My name, saying, ‘I am He’ [ἐγώ εἰμι] and, ‘The time is at hand’ [ὁ καιρὸς ἥγγικεν]; do not go after them. And when you hear of wars and disturbances, do not be terrified; for these things must take place first, but the end does not follow immediately.” Luke also chooses to relate this coming as related, not to false prophets, but to those who come falsely promising the Kingdom of God (17:20). Although the emphasis has shifted from Christ to the Kingdom the use of the Name as emblematic of the bearing, authority, and commission of Jesus remains the same.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

This misuse of the name of Jesus sounds clear echoes of the numerous Old Testament passages which speak of false prophets who came in the name of God (cf. Zech. 13:1-5, Jer. 14:13-16; 23:16,25). In this light it is suggestive that the respective Synoptic authors all use the name of Jesus as the source of authority rather than the name of God. It seems clear that Jesus’ name represents Jesus himself: his mission, authority, and sending by God. To claim that one comes in Jesus’ name means that the false prophet also has claimed the authority and commission of God.

In terms of Greco-Roman conventions, I know of no text that uses this expression. There were, however, instances when people would come in the name of Caesar in order to claim his authority when they gave his orders. This use parallels nicely what we have seen from the Christian and Jewish texts. Adding its weight to that of the Jewish evidence, we can say that to come in the name of Jesus meant that the person was claiming to come in the authority of Jesus himself.

PREACHING (PROCLAIMING), SPEAKING OR TEACHING IN THE NAME OF JESUS

We find in the New Testament various texts which speak of teaching (διδάσκειν-Acts 4:18; 5:28), speaking (λαλεῖν-Acts 4:17; 5:40), speaking boldly (ἐπαρρησιάσατο ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ-Acts 9:27,28.), and ‘preaching’ (κηρυχθῆναι-Lk. 24:47) in the name of Jesus. The antithesis, that is, to prohibit someone from speaking or teaching in the name of Jesus, is found at Acts 4:17-18 and 5: 28, where the Jewish authorities prohibit the apostles from these activities. It remains an open question as to exactly what is meant by these various expressions.

Some have mentioned as a suitable backdrop the possible rabbinic practice where one rabbi teaches in the name of another rabbi; that is, he draws on the authority of the other rabbi in a matter over a legal question, or passing on tradition. This suggestion is clearly not generally applicable, for as we see from Acts 4:17-18 (cf. 5:40), speaking in the name of Jesus amounts to teaching and preaching in the Name. The text reads:

But in order that it may not spread any further among the people, let us warn them to speak no more to any man in (ἐπί) this name.” 18 And when they had summoned them, they commanded them not to speak or teach at all in the name of Jesus.

As we know from the section on healing, the prohibition was aimed not only at the authority of Jesus, but also aimed at stopping the name of Jesus from being used in demonstrations of power. Indeed, the prohibition by the Jewish leaders against speaking in the name of Jesus hints that they believed the name of Jesus was a source of power so that one can say that the apostles had spoken “in der Kraft des Namens.”⁹⁵² The apostles clearly understand the situation in this manner for they do the opposite of the prohibition, i.e. they pray to God and ask Him to perform wonders and healings “through (διό) the name of your holy servant Jesus.”

In another passage, Lk. 24:46b-47, we read of the Risen Christ saying:

Thus it is written, that the Christ (τὸν χριστόν) should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance for forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in (ἐπί) His name (αὐτοῦ) to all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.

Now it is evident that the genitive αὐτοῦ refers back to τὸν χριστόν. As such the passage means to convey the fact that while the name of Jesus may be what is in the foreground, behind this stands Jesus’ work as the Messiah, who in accordance with the Scriptures had suffered and risen in order to save his people.⁹⁵³ Accordingly, it points to the salvific work of God *in* Jesus, as well as the recognition of the unique role of Jesus as mediator between God and man (cf. Heb. 13:15).⁹⁵⁴ A very significant passage for our understanding is Acts 8:12, where it

⁹⁵² Ruck-Schröder’s expression. *DNGJNT*, 190. While Ruck-Schröder is no doubt correct, Delling notes in addition, correctly in my view, that the prohibition of verse seventeen relates also to the claim in verse 12 that “there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men, by which we must be saved.” See *Die Zueignung*, 48.

⁹⁵³ Ruck-Schröder, *Ibid.*, 167.

⁹⁵⁴ Delling recognizes the notion of the saving acts of God in Jesus being included, but I think it also involves the acknowledgement that Jesus stands between God and man; indeed, the author of the very salvation which is preached in his name is the mediator to God. See, Delling, *Die Zueignung*, 47.

is reported that Philip preached to the Samaritans “the good news of the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ...” This passage establishes several very important points. This passage suggests that the name of Jesus conveys or mediates the Kingdom of God.⁹⁵⁵ In short, this passage means to convey the fact that the name of Jesus is preached as the name which must be called upon to be saved. Accordingly, the name of Jesus is not a *symbolon* of the Gospel alone, but also is the key which initiates the benefits of the Gospel and is therefore something that is preached (8:12) and believed in. Although we have some indication of how the name of Jesus functions in these passages we might ask how this data might yield other insights for our understanding of other functions.

First, all of the various expressions carry the sense of the authority of Jesus himself.⁹⁵⁶ In some particular cases, such as Acts 4:17-18, the name of Jesus must also be read as representing the Gospel message and its contents, as we have already seen.⁹⁵⁷ We also see this usage clearly in Rom. 15:20, where Paul expresses his desire to go to places and proclaim the Gospel. He expresses this as going to places where *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι οὐχ ὅπου ὠνομάσθη Χριστός* (where Christ is not ‘named’). Here, as in Acts 4:17-18, the name of Jesus (Christ) represents the Gospel message. With this understanding in hand, I shall turn to the analysis section.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

We have already encountered Ex.9: 16, which states that the Lord told Moses that His name was to be proclaimed in the entire world. This command was issued during the confrontation between the Pharaoh of Egypt (who was a symbol of the power of this world) and God. Hence, the name of God represents God in this text as a world conqueror; that is, as the Lord of all the earth. Moreover, it is clear that this usage signifies that through the proclaiming of

⁹⁵⁵ Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 173. Ruck-Schröder observes that the proclamation of the Kingdom *and* the power in the name of Jesus go together in the apostolic mission. She states, “Die Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes und *die wunderwirkende Kraft Jesu, die in seinem Namen präsent ist* [emphasis Ruck-Schröder’s], gehören im Wirken der Apostel zusammen.” As with everything else, Nägelsbach holds to the view that this act means only that the person is in possessive relationship with Jesus. Here Nägelsbach points to Acts 8:12 and notes that as soon as the people had received the message of Phillip they immediately consented to baptism. Thus, Nägelsbach draws his connection and concludes that proclaiming the name of Jesus stands in close connection to baptism after conversion. For Nägelsbach’s views see *DNGJHS*, 73.

⁹⁵⁶ Ziegler, “The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles,” 33.

⁹⁵⁷ Also in favor of adopting this view are Heitmüller and Ziesler. See, *INJ*, 61-62, and “The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles,” 33.

His name God Himself is exalted. By proclaiming God's name, His fame is spread, as well as the covenant which he has established with His people. This usage clearly situates this type of action among those passages where the Name stands as a surrogate, sometimes for God, sometimes for His deeds, but always tilted toward revelation.

In fact, the notion of proclaiming the name of Jesus is correctly seen by Scherer against the backdrop of God's disclosure of his name to Moses in the narrative of Exodus 3: 13-15, where Moses receives the divine name as a seal of authentication for his divine mission. With this backdrop in place, Sherer proposes that the proclaiming of the name of Jesus in Acts 8:12 carries the same broad theological import as the narrative about the sending of Moses. Accordingly, the 'proclaiming of the Name' in Acts is meant to convey the thought that those whom God has sent (the *apostoloi*) come in the power and authority of Jesus. In essence then, one might say that the function of the name of YHWH in the Old Testament revelation and proclamation has now been extended in the early Christian communities to the name of Jesus.⁹⁵⁸

In a loose fashion, those passages that speak of proclaiming the name of Jesus not only take on broadly similar shading as O.T. passages involving the name of God, but more importantly the name of Jesus now plays a crucial central role in salvation history. Proclaiming or preaching the name of Jesus meant to proclaim salvation in his name. This usage clearly is associated to the phenomenon of calling on Jesus' name for salvation. Hence, proclaiming the name of Jesus meant to tell others that Jesus' name is *the* name of salvation. We have also observed that speaking or proclaiming the name of Jesus can also take on shadings of telling others that Jesus' name is *the* name of power. The name of Jesus can cast out demons and cure the sick, and Christians broadcast this fact to others. Finally, it is worth noting that nowhere do we see in Judaism any figure whose name is preached as a salvific name. This makes the name of Jesus completely unique in salvation history.

'DO ALL' IN THE NAME OF JESUS

According to Col. 3:16-17 the Christian should do all in the name of Jesus. The passage reads in full:

Let the word of Christ richly dwell within you, with all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with

⁹⁵⁸ For Sherer see James A. Scherer, "Missiological Naming: 'Who shall I Say Sent Me?'" in *Our Naming of God: Problems and Prospects of God-Talk Today*. Augsburg Fortress, 1989, 111-126.

thankfulness in your hearts to God. 17 And whatever you do in word or deed, do all in (ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ἰησοῦ) the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks through Him to God the Father.

Some scholars, such as Nägelsbach, maintain that this means only that this passage conveys the notion that by acting in the name of Jesus everyone can recognize that the person belongs to Jesus.⁹⁵⁹ Other scholars, such as Delling, maintain that the expression means that the actions are done in recognition of the Lordship of Christ.⁹⁶⁰ This means that the author prompts his readers to *carry out their lives* (i.e. their conduct) in terms of Jesus' claim over their lives. In addition to this observation, Ruck-Schröder emphasizes the connection between Col. 3:17 and 1:13. Col. 1:13 reads, "For He [God] delivered us from the domain of darkness, and transferred us to the kingdom of His beloved Son." This connection suggests transference into the realm of Jesus. Accordingly, the admonishment means that the author's readers now exist in "den Herrschaftsbereich [emphasis Ruck-Schröder's] des Sohnes..."⁹⁶¹

Another aspect is that the author also reminds his readers that by carrying out all of these actions in Jesus' name they give thanks to God, *through* Jesus (*in* his name? Cf. Eph. 5:20). In other words, by extension, when they carry out their Christian duties in the name of Jesus they give glory to God, and the name of Jesus serves once again as a sort of bridge between God and man.⁹⁶² Stated more pointedly, by conducting themselves in a manner consistent with the Gospel, as well as their carrying out their worship and other cultic behavior in a manner pleasing to God, they give glory to God. Indeed, only those actions that are done in or to Jesus' name (as the symbol for Jesus' position as mediator between God and man) are acceptable to God.

⁹⁵⁹ Nägelsbach, *DNGJHS*, 71. Ruck-Schröder, more correctly in my view, argues that the name serves as an indication of the 'Machtbereich' of the bearer of the name, and accordingly the passage signifies that the community acts under the Lordship authority of Jesus himself. She observes that 3:17 picks up on 1:13, where the Son's kingdom is spoken of. She also rightly points out that actions done in the name of Jesus on the part of the community result in deeds done for the glory of God. See Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 96; Cf. Heitmüller, who thinks it means the naming of the name of Jesus. See *INJ*, 68, 260.

⁹⁶⁰ Delling, *Die Zueignung*, 54. Ruck-Schröder has pointed out in this context that the fact that the community will carry out their actions in Jesus' name takes on similar shadings as a confession of the Lordship of Jesus. See, *DNGJNT*, 266.

⁹⁶¹ Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 96.

⁹⁶² The concept of a mediating role is found often in the New Testament, either in terms of Jesus, or through his name. Examples are John 1:3, 7, 10; Acts 3:16; Rom. 1:5; 11:36; Eph. 2:18; Col. 1:20; Heb. 7:25; 1 Peter 1:21; 1 Jn. 4:9.

Correspondingly, actions which are pleasing to God, when done in Jesus name, bring honor to God,⁹⁶³ as I Cor. 10:31 states, “Whether, then, you eat or drink or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God,” but as Col. 3:16-17 makes clear, these actions take place *in reference to* Jesus’ name.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

This particular use of the name of Jesus has no direct analog as far as I know in Jewish piety—at least it was not put to paper as far as I know. Still, the Old Testament notion of ‘walking’ in the name of God is very similar. For example, as we saw earlier, Micah 4:5 states that religious conventicles are defined by the name of the divinity in which they walk, i.e. the name in which they carry out their acts and their adherence to the religious code prescribed by their faith system. This sense of following God’s commandments (doing things that please God) is demonstrated in Zech. 10:12, where God speaks of the gathering of the Diaspora Jews and then the text ends with this promise, “And I shall strengthen them in the LORD, and in His name they will walk.”

In the sense that ‘walking’ is similar to carrying out actions in God’s name we may speak of some informal points of similarity between this Old Testament usage and the command in Col. 3: 16-17. When we recall that ‘walking’ in the name of God means that God is the frame of reference for the actions of the covenantal communities, we can therefore also infer from Col. 3:16-17 that Jesus is the frame of reference for the *new* covenantal people of God. While such emphasis does not by any means exclude God, it nonetheless is striking that now, in the era of the dawning of the Kingdom of *God*, *Jesus* has become the frame of reference for the community.

This ‘walking’ in the name of God underscores that those who follow their respective gods will carry out their lives and religious obligations in the names of their gods, thus they carry out their lives in close relationship to their gods.⁹⁶⁴ Jews, the chosen and covenant-bound people of God, must walk only in His name, just as the non-Jew ‘walks’ in the names of their gods. This

⁹⁶³ So too Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 96-97.

⁹⁶⁴ Boehmer correctly draws attention to this close relationship but fails to note the fact that a additional facet is in view, viz. that people not only live in close relationship with their gods, but also that they fulfill the obligations mandated by the gods. That is to say, it expresses the notion that one lives faithfully within the moral strictures, as well as the prescribed ritual and cultic behavior of the faith. For Boehmer’s take on this expression see *BIN*, 61.

great Name distinguished, in part, the people of God from the nations. Of course this adherence carried all sorts of religious obligations, e.g., rites and cultus, religious scruples, etc., all of which were to be carried out in the power and authority of the Name. But now, the new people of God use the name of Jesus and this usage has obvious christological significance, i.e. Jesus is the head of the Church, its Lord and Savior. Moreover, this command to 'do all' in the name of Jesus is not mirrored by any Jewish texts in terms of any figure, angelic or human, apart from God. Thus, Jesus' name once again stands alone, unparalleled by any mediator figure in Second Temple Judaism.

CALLING THE NAME OF JESUS OVER SOMEONE OR SOMETHING

In Acts 15:14 we read that in the midst of the Jerusalem Council James arose and stated that God would draw out a λαὸς τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. The inspiration for this eschatological gathering is drawn from Deut. 14:2, where we read that, "For you are a holy people to the LORD your God; and the LORD has chosen you to be a people for His own possession out of all the peoples who are on the face of the earth." As for its literal literary derivation, Acts 15:17 quotes directly from Amos 9:11-12, which as we have already seen applied in its O.T. context to the name of God. It is worth a quick reminder what the text says. It states:

In that day I will raise up the fallen booth of David
And wall up its breaches; I will also raise up its ruins,
And rebuild it as in the days of old; That they may possess the remnant of Edom
12 And all the nations who are called by My name,"
Declares the LORD who does this.

It is noteworthy that this passage begins with the temporal clue that the name will be used "in that day." This is a clear signal that these passages are eschatological in nature and signifies that in the author's mind the name of Jesus has become operational in the promised New Age of the dawning of the Kingdom of God.⁹⁶⁵

⁹⁶⁵ Franz Georg Untergaßmair, *Im Namen Jesu beten: biblische Impluse zu christlichem Gebet* (Stuttgart: Katholischen Bibelwerk, 1990), 62. This interpretation stands in contrast to other attempts to understand this use of the name of Jesus in a non-eschatological fashion. Untergaßmair has an excellent summary of the various other attempts to understand this phrase. In brief he notes R. Bultmann, S. Schultz, and F. Büchsel's view that the phrase means, "unter Berufung auf ihn." L. Bouyer's view is that it means, "im Glauben an ihm." A. Schlatter's view that it means, "nach seinem Willen, in seinem Auftrag zur Erfüllung der Sendung, die er den Jüngern gegeben hat." M-J Lagrange and W. Baur's view of "unter Nennung des Namens Jesu." F. Tillmann's interpretation of, "in meiner Person, d.h. in der innigsten Gemeinschaft mit Jesus." F.M. Braun claims that it means, "en faisant appel à son pouvoir." We have seen that the phrase really has an eschatological basis and signifies God's creation of a chosen people. For more details See, *INJJE*, 63-64.

We should recall from the section which dealt with the phenomenological use of the name of God, that Amos 9:11-12 signified that the object or person over whom the Name was called became the possession of God. When taken together with Deut. 14:2, we arrive at a proper understanding of the meaning of Acts 15:17. In effect, God will ‘call out’ from among the nations a group of people, an eschatological community, which, because they are called by Jesus’ name they belong *to* Jesus. Of course this transference from the world, to a possession of Jesus, took place at the moment of baptism.⁹⁶⁶

Beyond this, it is also noteworthy that the statements made at the Council refer to the events which occurred at the house of Cornelius. The events serve to demonstrate, through the conversion of Cornelius and his household, that God had now swung the door of salvation wide open in order to admit Gentiles to the new faith. This passage thus makes clear that the Church is equated with the ‘new’ Israel, populated with both Jew and non-Jew.⁹⁶⁷

Another prominent passage which speaks of calling out of the name of Jesus comes from James 2:7, where we read: οὐκ αὐτοῖς βλασφημοῦσιν τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς. We know from our investigation on the Jewish materials that this phrase is a septuagintalism which signified that the object or person belonged to God. In the present context though, while not calling into question this meaning, it should be pointed out that this idiom also reflects the events surrounding baptism.⁹⁶⁸ As such, we may read into this expression that the name of Jesus was called out over the baptizand,⁹⁶⁹ and that the person was now a member of the ‘Jesus’ movement.⁹⁷⁰

⁹⁶⁶ Ruck-Schröder, *DNJGNT*, 199.

⁹⁶⁷ Ruck-Schröder quoting Conzelmann. See *DNGJNT*, 198. As for Conzelmann see Hans Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*, 3rd ed., (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960): 200 fn. 2.

⁹⁶⁸ Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 113. As Davids has noted, the baptismal context helps to explain the use of the aorist here.

⁹⁶⁹ Pace R. Martin. Curiously, Martin believes that God’s name is meant here. Martin makes no effort to explain this reading and it seems to me that it must almost certainly be wrong. For Martin’s views on James see, Ralph P. Martin, *James*, Word Biblical Commentary, V. 48, (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1988), 66-67, 206-210.

⁹⁷⁰ I adopt this phrase for as Hartman’s study shows, the expression in baptism reflects a concern to show the person to whom the rite derives its fundamental referent. Seen in this light, it is possible to describe Christian baptism as a ‘Jesus’ baptism (to borrow Hartman’s expression). This understanding lends the rite a rich christological flavor. For further discussion see Lars Hartman, “‘Into the Name of Jesus,’ A Suggestion Concerning the Earliest Meaning of the Phrase,” 439.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

In order to grasp the deeper meaning of this phrase we must look at two analogous passages. The first comes from the Jewish portion of II Esdras 4:22-25, which reads:

Then I answered and said, 'I implore you, my lord, why have I been endowed with the power of understanding? For I did not wish to inquire about the ways above, but about those things that we daily experience: why Israel has been given over to the Gentiles in disgrace...We pass from the world like locusts...and we are not worthy to obtain mercy. But what will he do for his Name that is invoked over us?'

We see here that in II Esdras, as was the case in Amos 9, the name which was invoked over the elect is YHWH. Now this invocation is not treated as a mere formality. Instead, the author actually stresses to God the necessity that He act for the sake of the very Name which was invoked over them. Such signification most certainly transcends a simple formality.

The argument in II Esdras 4:22-25 signifies that God's name is so bound up with His revelation and His relationship with His people that He must act. Understanding this, we need to look at the meaning of the phrase in Christian practice.

In terms of Christian practice, this act signifies that the ones over whom the name of Jesus is invoked now belong to him, just as in the previous dispensation those who had God's name called out over them became God's possession: a chosen people elected to experience His salvation and His covenant. This replacement of the name of God, with the name of Jesus, found its rationale in the early Church because of the Church's belief that Jesus' name was the name to be invoked for salvation in conformity to Joel 2:21. Because Jesus' name was the name of salvation, it was thought worthy to be called out (or invoked) over a new believer. It was, after all, the name which was called out during baptism. By adhering to the logical consequences of using Jesus' name, instead of God's, for the carrying out of the promise of salvation in Joel 3:5 (LXX), Jesus' name became *the* 'name' of salvation in all its varied contexts and uses. By invoking the name of Jesus during baptism the baptizand entered into a new relationship to God; that is, he or she now belonged to His 'Son.'

BAPTISM IN THE NAME OF JESUS

The rite of baptism has rightly taken up the lion's share of scholarly attention over the last century in terms of those scholars who have investigated the importance of the name of Jesus. This attention is completely warranted when we stop to consider that the rite of baptism is filled with christological significance, and that baptismal imagery can express this christological

significance in various ways. As we shall see, within the New Testament, baptismal motifs are much more rich and variegated than Heitmüller's simple belief that baptism signified only transference of the baptizand to Jesus. Indeed, various New Testament writers pressed baptismal imagery into service and fashioned it to their own ends.

On the whole, scholarship on baptism and the name of Jesus can be divided between earlier scholars, who emphasized the linguistic arguments (i.e. the use of various prepositions in the baptismal formula in conjunction with the name of Jesus), and later scholars, who brushed aside such concerns and instead focused on the context and/or the meaning of baptism as suggested from Jewish comparative materials. These latter scholars concluded that the New Testament does not offer us a uniform picture in terms of prepositional use. This ambiguous situation has created an exegetical quagmire of sorts. Scholars such as Delling and Hartman have persuasively argued that instead of attempting to fix an interpretation based on various prepositions the only sound method for discovering the meaning and significance of baptism is by looking at the context, and making use of any light shed by comparative background materials.⁹⁷¹ In my opinion, the abandonment of the attempt to explain the meaning of baptism in terms of various prepositions (and the like) is completely warranted.⁹⁷² I, too, shall follow suit and look solely at the context and historical roots of baptism as my means of uncovering the meaning and significance of baptism.

Now in order to appreciate this significance it will be useful to conduct this portion of my study in two phases. The first phase will look briefly at some of the more important New Testament texts which speak about baptism and the name of Jesus in the same breath. Other

⁹⁷¹ In the case of the latter, both men come to the conclusion that the phrase comes from the thought world provided from the LXX. Bietenhard too, rejects any notion that the meaning of baptism can be derived from Greek commercial expressions; he sees a Hebraic background to the εἰς τὸ ὄνομα prepositional phrase (i.e., לְשֵׁם). For further details, see Delling, *Die Zueignung*, 42; Hartman, *Auf den Namen des Herrn*, 40, 45; and Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 275.

⁹⁷² I have already mentioned the possibility that the author of Lk-Acts seems to employ certain prepositions with some purpose in mind. But in terms of baptism there are not sufficient examples to draw any firm conclusions based on the authors' use of various prepositions. Hartman concurs with this view, but others, such as Delling, beg to differ. Delling thinks he detects certain fixed meanings. For example, the preposition ἐπὶ means, "„auf Grund deren“ die Taufe vollzogen wird." Εἰς signifies, "Die Richtung, den „Beziehungspunkt“, auf den hin die Taufe geschieht" (Delling does offer a nuance concerning Mt. 28:19, here he thinks the expression means, "Auf den Heilszusammenhang hin, dem der Täufling eingefügt wird"). With respect to the preposition ἐν Delling concludes that this combination means, "Im Blick (unter Beziehung) auf die mit diesem Namen bezeichnete Heilswirklichkeit." See Delling, *Die Zueignung*, 92-96, and Hartman, *Auf den Namen des Herrn*, 39.

passages which discuss baptism, but which do not expressly mention the name of Jesus, will be ignored. Here I shall look at what these texts can tell us in their local contexts. The second phase examines Christian baptism in light of what we know of other similar religious rites in Jewish and Greco-Roman belief. After these two phases are completed, I shall turn to the question of the significance of the use of the name of Jesus.⁹⁷³

The best place to begin is where the author of the Book of Acts claims the rite began: in the events of Pentecost which are cast by the author of Acts as the fulfillment of Joel 2: 21. This outpouring was, for Joel, restricted to God's people (cf. Ez. 39:29); that is, it was reserved for those whom YHWH had called out from among the various nations to be His people. There is reciprocity to this arrangement: those whom YHWH calls will be those who in turn call upon His name. This new people of God, according to the author of Acts, will heed a new call for repentance and a confession of Jesus as the Lord installed by God's edict. Now in terms of the use of Jesus' name, the justification for the fact that Jesus' name is the reference for the baptism is found in 2:36, where Peter makes clear that God has made Jesus, *κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός*. Because Jesus now occupies these exalted positions his name can be used in lieu of the Tetragrammaton.

Recalling our earlier observations on Acts 2:38 it is clear that the author sees the events of Pentecost as the eschatological fulfillment of God's promise to visit His people in the End Times. By invoking the name of Jesus, and submitting to baptism, the baptizand became incorporated into the new eschatological people of God. Obedience to the call for repentance was predicated not only on the salvific actions of Jesus' ministry, but also upon the realization that the promised Kingdom of God was now dawning. Additionally, this baptism was a baptism for the forgiveness of sins and this is confirmed at verse 40, where in the narrative Peter exhorts his listeners to allow themselves to be saved, and in the immediately following verse the listeners are said to undergo baptism. This binding of baptism and forgiveness of sins is also found at Acts 2:38, where Peter states, "Repent and be baptized, everyone of you, in the name of Jesus Christ

⁹⁷³ Interestingly, and somewhat inexplicably, Hans Von Campenhausen thinks that there never was a baptismal formula which had the name of Jesus at its heart. His main argument hinges upon Paul's statement in I Cor. 1:12-13, where Paul asks rhetorically, "Were any of you baptized into my name?" Von Campenhausen extrapolates from this and claims that the statement that some Corinthians were baptized into Jesus' name is also therefore just a rhetorical flourish! To review Hans Freiherr Von Campenhausen's arguments see, "Taufen auf den Namen Jesu?," *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (1971): 1-16.

for the forgiveness of sins. And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.”⁹⁷⁴ If we peer a bit closer at the verse, as well as the broader picture which the author paints in the Gospel of Luke, several features stand out as worthy of note.

First, the entire Pentecost speech attributed to Peter is programmatic for the author. This is most clearly seen when we compare Lk. 24: 47b-49 to Acts 2:38. In the Gospel the author states that during Jesus’ post-resurrection appearance he claims that his suffering was done in accordance with the Scriptures, but also that shortly into the future:

Repentance for forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in his [sic] name to all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. 48 “You are witnesses of these things. 49 “Behold, I am sending forth the promise of My Father upon you; but you are to stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high.

This passage, in so many words, forms the backbone of the programmatic approach which the author adopts and its fulfillment fills the pages of the author’s companion work to the Gospel. Key to this program is the connection between forgiveness of sins in the name of Jesus, and the bestowal of the Spirit (Lk. 24:49, “power from on high”), a connection which the author expressly draws. When we return to the narrative in Acts chapter two we see a similar connection being drawn (2:38, “And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit”). Further points of interest are that Jesus claims in his post-resurrection speech that this connection between the bestowal of the Spirit and forgiveness of sins in his name is attested to by God’s own word (24:46-47: γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ⁴⁷καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη; cf. Acts 1:8). This claim mirrors the similar claim put in the mouth of Peter later on that all of the prophets testify (3:24: πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν) that forgiveness of sins would take place in Jesus’ name. We see here yet again that this motif performs a programmatic function within the author’s *Heilsgeschichte*.⁹⁷⁵

⁹⁷⁴ Gerhard Barth, “Taufe auf den Namen Jesu,” 52.

⁹⁷⁵ Insofar as the reception of the Spirit signaled that the baptizand was now a Christian, that is, the bestowal of the Spirit led to the notion that the baptizand was now a ‘Son of God,’ it is obvious that baptism in Jesus’ name is laden with christological significance. Baptism in *Jesus’ name*, bestows *God’s* spirit. For further details see, Hartman, *Auf den Namen des Herrn*, 26.

Other important features in Acts 2:38 that deserve notice are that the clause, ‘Repent and be baptized,’ constitutes a conditional construction.⁹⁷⁶ In fact, the sequence, imperative + καί + future, signal that repentance and baptism are requirements to receive the Holy Spirit. Needless to say, the Spirit is reserved for those who invoke his name,⁹⁷⁷ and this outpouring was seen as the fulfillment of the eschatological promise of God.⁹⁷⁸ There is yet more that can be said in favor of some sort of connection between baptism in the name of Jesus and reception of the Spirit.

For example, for the author of Luke-Acts it is clear that the baptism of John was a baptism of repentance which, although carried out with water (e.g., Lk. 3:16; Acts 1:5, 11:16), did not result in the bestowal of the Holy Spirit (Acts 19:2f.). Furthermore, in Acts 10:48 we find Peter’s command to baptize the household of Cornelius; thereafter Cornelius’ household is said to have received the Spirit immediately after Peter’s statement that all who repent in the name of Jesus would find forgiveness of sins (Acts 10:43-44; cf. 22:16). Correspondingly, although we see some variability concerning baptism and the reception of the Spirit in Acts, the author nevertheless held to some attachment between the two.

Moving outside of the Book of Acts, another passage of import is found in I Cor. 6:11, where in an apparent allusion to baptism⁹⁷⁹ Paul describes the state of his charges in the following manner, “...you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of

⁹⁷⁶ Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 125.

⁹⁷⁷ Hartman, *Auf den Namen des Herrn Jesus*, 127.

⁹⁷⁸ Ibid., 59. Hartman in this context says, “Nicht die Drohung einer bevorstehenden Krise prägt Umkehrverkündigung und Taufe, sondern die Vorstellung, daß jetzt die eschatologischen Gaben gegeben werden, die vom Werk Jesu und seiner Erhöhung abhängen und dadurch frei geworden sind.” See pg. 133. Haenchen’s read of the data also comes to the conclusion that for the author of Acts the gift of the Spirit and water baptism are bound together. Moreover, Ruck-Schröder observes that the important exception of Acts 8:17 (cf. 19:1-6), where those people who were converted in Samaria had been baptized, but did not receive the Spirit until John and Peter came and lay hands upon them, serves Luke’s apostolic motive and is thus no indication for a Spirit-free baptism. See, Ernst Haenchen, *Apostelgeschichte*. KEK, Abt. 3, 12, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), 258, and Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 173.

⁹⁷⁹ Most commentators accept that baptism is in view, although the entire process of salvation is evidently also entertained here. Now interestingly, the imagery in 6:11 is generally thought to lie outside of Paul himself. This passage therefore finds a further importance in that it presumably delivers a traditional understanding of one of the effects of baptism, not just Paul’s own view. For more on this aspect see Hartman, *Auf den Namen des Herrn*, 83.

the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God.”⁹⁸⁰ It is exegetically accepted that the actions described by these three verbs are all carried out ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου.⁹⁸¹ Apparently, by this expression Paul is thinking here in terms of an *Anrufung* of the name of Jesus during baptism.⁹⁸² Not to be overlooked too is the striking parallelism between ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and, ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ.

This parallelism highlights the fact that baptism is efficacious both because Jesus’ name is invoked,⁹⁸³ and also because the Spirit of God works in the baptism. The fact that the author places the name of Jesus and the Spirit of God in such close proximity (and parallelism) implies a direct connection in the author’s mind between the bestowal of the Spirit in baptism and the invocation of the name of Jesus during the baptismal rite.⁹⁸⁴ In this context, I Cor. 12:3 takes on new meaning when we read, “No one can say κύριος Ἰησοῦς except by the Holy Spirit.” As this passage makes clear, it is the Spirit of God which enables a person to recognize Jesus as the κύριος and to confess in faith that he is the Lord who saves. This fact translates into the conclusion that it is the Spirit which allows the baptizand to call out Jesus’ name in faith.⁹⁸⁵ Furthermore, it is the name of Jesus, as well as the Spirit of God, which serves as, in the words of

⁹⁸⁰ The use of the metaphor of washing of sins (through baptism) is also found elsewhere in the New Testament. For example, from the pen of the author of Acts we find at 22:16 that Paul is said, while defending himself before his fellow Jews in Jerusalem, to make a call to repentance and he states that, “Why do you delay? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on His name.” Another prominent example is Titus 3:5, where the Deutero-Pauline author writes, “He saved us, not on the basis of deeds which we have done in righteousness, but according to His mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewing by the Holy Spirit.

⁹⁸¹ So Steyn, who quotes a host of authorities to this effect. See “To Onoma tou Kyriou in I Cor.,” 487 fn. 49. Ruck-Schröder also understands ἐν in an instrumental sense in regards to all three verbs. See, *DNGJNT*, 79.

⁹⁸² Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 79.

⁹⁸³ The name of Jesus is to be understood in the instrumental sense. Ruck-Schröder also understands the passage in this way, as does Conzelmann, who she follows in this context. See *DNGJNT*, 79.

⁹⁸⁴ So too Ruck-Schröder. In connection to I Cor. 6:11, she rightly points out that it is the Spirit who allows the baptizand to call out the name of Jesus. Some expositors have thought along the lines that Jesus’ name must be spoken out first, and then the Spirit is ‘activated’ so to speak. Ruck-Schröder notes the obvious difficulty in positing that the Spirit is subordinate to the name of Jesus. Indeed, the three verbs are in the passive and this signifies that it is God who brings these three actions into realization as both Hartman and Delling recognized. See, *Auf den Namen des Herrn*, 65; Ruck-Schröder, *DNGJNT*, 79-80; and Delling, *Die Zueignung*, 56.

⁹⁸⁵ Hartman correctly notes that in terms of this particular passage Paul thinks here only of the present work of the Spirit to effect the salvific actions and that we can not draw any inference about a connection between the bestowal of the Spirit and baptism based on this passage alone. See *Auf dem Namen des Herrn*, 66.

Ruck-Schröder, “*die Kraftquelle der Taufe*” [emphasis mine].”⁹⁸⁶ The above-noted parallelism between the name of Jesus and the ‘Spirit of God’ suggests that the name of Jesus has the same claim to divine authority, power, and status as the Spirit of God.

Of further import is that Paul saw this act as a decisive eschatological act, for I Cor. 6:11a says of Paul’s readers, “And this is what some of you *were*....” This reference is to be understood in relationship to 6:9, where Paul says, “Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the Kingdom of God...” In light of the larger context, it is implied that through the baptismal rite the baptizand becomes incorporated into the Kingdom of God and this puts an eschatological tinge to the entire event (cf. Acts 28:31 and especially 8:12, where the two phrases, τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, and, τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ are brought together).

In any case, the effects of baptism according to I Cor. 6:11 are of course profound: the Christian is washed, sanctified, and justified through baptism, brought near to God, transformed, transferred into the Kingdom of God, *when* baptism is carried out by calling on the name of Jesus.⁹⁸⁷ What, however, is the import of this transference into the Kingdom of God (i.e., incorporation into the community of believers) in Jesus’ name?

Baptism played a central role in that it functioned as the entry point for the formation of a new community (I Cor. 12:13; cf. Gal. 3:28; Eph. 4:5).⁹⁸⁸ The reader may recall that in the introduction I made mention of the fact that cultic acts formed the very brick and mortar by which a religious community constructed its ideological walls and it forms a sort of barrier between the community and those who do not share the same convictions. In this sense one may rightfully say that baptism stands in relationship to Christianity in the exact same fashion that circumcision stands within Judaism—it signals inclusion into the redeemed people of God who will experience His salvation and eschatological benefits in the world to come. Indeed, we can even speak in terms of baptism *of Jesus’ name replacing circumcision*.

With I Cor. 6:11 reviewed, I shall turn to other passages which employ different imagery. Of interest here is the notion that the baptizand had been transferred to the ownership of Jesus. In

⁹⁸⁶ Ibid. Ruck-Schröder suggests, and I agree, that the name of Jesus insures not only the power of Jesus, but also his presence, while the Spirit of God naturally insures the presence and power of God during the rite.

⁹⁸⁷ This is seen very clearly at Acts 22:16, where as we have seen in footnote 980, Paul states to his listeners, ‘And now why do you delay? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on His name.’

⁹⁸⁸ Ibid., 81. See also, “Into the Name of Jesus,” 29.

spite of Heitmüller's over reliance on Greek commercial expressions, and his all encompassing explanation of baptism in terms of transference of the baptizand to Jesus, there is at least one passage which does unquestionably highlight this meaning. Here I refer to I Cor. 1: 10-13.

Although the passage does not expressly mention the name of Jesus, it nevertheless does take up the issue of what baptism into the name of Jesus means. In this passage, Paul speaks of divisions in the Corinthian assembly. Different groups within the community who had allied themselves with various leaders in the early Church engendered these divisions. Now let us briefly look at the passage in full:

Now I exhort you, brethren, by the name (διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος) of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all agree, and there be no divisions among you, but you be made complete in the same mind and in the same judgment. 11 For I have been informed concerning you, my brethren, by Chloe's people, that there are quarrels among you. 12 Now I mean this, that each one of you is saying, "I am of Paul," and "I of Apollos," and "I of Cephas," and "I of Christ." 13 Has Christ been divided? Paul was not crucified for you, was he? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul?

Clearly, Paul intends on combating the forces of division, and he draws upon three arguments: first, it is impossible for Christ to be divided, therefore, as followers of Christ they too are not to be divided. Second, it was Christ who was crucified for the Corinthian believers—not Paul, or Peter or any other person; thus, the believers have become Christians based on the salvific works of Jesus. Paul's third argument is that the Corinthians were all baptized into the name of Jesus.⁹⁸⁹ Paul's argument is clear enough, but how does this relate to the notion of possession? If we look a bit closer at this latter claim we see that while Paul asks, "Were you baptized into the name of Paul," at verse 13, just immediately prior to this in verse 12 Paul states that the Corinthians are saying that they *belong* to one person or another. Here the connection between possession and baptism is made abundantly clear. It would seem fair to assume that the Corinthians received this understanding from Paul himself and that for Paul baptism could mean the baptizand is brought into the possession of Christ. Stated differently, they are under the

⁹⁸⁹ Heitmüller, *INJ*, 118. Heitmüller states, "...der ganze Tenor von I Kor. 1_{12ff.} zu der Annahme zwingt, dass der Name Christi bei der Taufe genannt wurde....Auch dass Korinther nicht εἰς τὸ ὄνομα des Kephas oder des Apollos, sondern εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ getauft sind, muss für die Leser zum Greifen klar gewesen sein."

lordship of the person that they were baptized 'into.'⁹⁹⁰ Essentially, this passage speaks of transference of the baptizand to Jesus, a sort of "*Herrschaftswechsel*."⁹⁹¹

Now that we have reviewed some of the more prominent baptismal imagery I shall turn my attention to the comparative materials.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

When we turn to examine Jewish or Greco-Roman parallels to Christian baptism we find that no 'true' parallels exist. With respect to prior Greco-Roman 'baptisms' it must be said that there simply are none that can serve as true analogs and which therefore can serve in facilitating a comparison to Christian baptism. True enough, Apuleius informs us that he underwent ritual washings when he was dedicated to the cult of Isis,⁹⁹² but in this case Apuleius speaks in terms of lustrations which are designed to render the initiate ritually clean. In contrast, Christian baptism was a baptism for the remission of sins. Its orientation was eschatological, unlike Apuleius' 'here-and-now' concern to bring about ritual purity.⁹⁹³ Another meaningful difference is that Christian baptism was performed by another Christian *to* the baptizand. In other terms, Apuleius washed himself, a practice common in ritual lustrations. Finally, and most importantly, we have no direct evidence that this particular rite was carried out in the name of the god, even though we have good reason to suppose that it might have been.

In terms of Jewish rites, the ritual lustrations which were practiced at the time were certainly not a 'baptism.' These lustrations suffer from the same shortcomings that what we have just observed about Apuleius' initiation into the mysteries of Isis. Like the lustrations of the Gentile world, Jewish lustrations were designed only to render the believer ritually clean.⁹⁹⁴

⁹⁹⁰ So Ziesler, "The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles," 31. See also Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus. Eine Studie zur Paulinische Theologie, München Theologische Studien*, 1. Historische Abteilung, Band 1, eds. Franz Xaver Seppelt, Joseph Pascher, and Klaus Mörsdorf, (München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1950), 15-17.

⁹⁹¹ G. Barth's wording. See Barth, "Taufe auf den Namen Jesu," 54. Naturally, this conclusion would go hand in hand with those who see baptism as an exorcistic rite with apotropaic overtones. For further discussions see, Otto Böcher, *Christus Exorcista*, 89.

⁹⁹² *Met.* 11.23.1.

⁹⁹³ It must be pointed out that later so-called 'baptisms', such as the Taurobolium, post-date the New Testament and almost certainly reflect the concern to mirror Christian rituals-the rituals of a faith that was finding success in the Greco-Roman world.

⁹⁹⁴ Josephus mentions that his spiritual tutor Bannus often bathed himself to remain pure. See *Vita* 11.

These cleansings were not signs of conversion; instead they rendered the already converted ritually clean so that they could partake in cultic rites.

Jewish proselyte 'baptism' also existed, but, while superficially similar in that the rite signaled the entry into the religious community, it differed in many significant ways.⁹⁹⁵

The only remaining candidate which might offer some similarities to Christian baptism is the baptism of John. In John's baptism we find three points of commonality: first, the baptism had an eschatological orientation; second, the baptism was a baptism of forgiveness; third, the baptizand was baptized by another person.⁹⁹⁶

Still, for all of its similarities to John's baptism, Christian baptism is *sui generis*.⁹⁹⁷ To begin with it should be noted that while much is known about both Christian and Johannine baptism, by any comparative measure Christian baptism is *most* differentiated from Johannine baptism by the baptismal formula which uses the name of Jesus.⁹⁹⁸ Another feature that I believe is unique to Christian baptism is that Christian baptism was executed in terms of entrance into the Kingdom of God.⁹⁹⁹ Indeed, Christian baptism placed the believer between the two poles of

⁹⁹⁵ For instance, like ritual lustrations, but unlike Christian baptism, the proselyte performed the ritual themselves. Although both Christian baptism and proselyte baptism were baptisms of conversion, proselyte baptism lacked any eschatological orientation. Absent too, so far as we know, was any connection with the forgiveness of sins. So, while some similarities exist, the differences overwhelm the common traits and point us in a different direction.

⁹⁹⁶ Ibid., 19, 35. Idem., "Into the Name of Jesus," 28, 31-32.

⁹⁹⁷ This uniqueness can be seen in the variable imagery which surfaces now and again in the Epistles.

⁹⁹⁸ Gerhard Barth, "Taufe auf den Namen Jesu," 50. The call to be baptized in the name of Jesus might possibly derive from an established cult formula. See, *Corp. Herm.* I 26; Apuleius, *Met.* XI 22; and finally, *Acts of Thomas* 73.78.

⁹⁹⁹ Most authors fail to note that the reoccurring connection between the name of Jesus, and the 'Kingdom of God' are also singular traits of Christian baptism. John's baptism emphasized repentance and escape from the eschatological wrath to come, while Christian baptism emphasized more the entry into the Kingdom of God with its positive corollary; the baptizand in the process becomes a recipient of the promises of God. That one can not simply equate the baptism of repentance of John and its Christian variant is amply stressed by Behm (as quoted in Hartman, "Baptism 'Into the Name of Jesus' and Early Christology," 42; Hartman quotes from J. Behm, "μετανοέω," *ThWNT* V, 4 (1942), 998; "Aus der Umkehr erwächst in der Verkündigung Jesu der Glaube (Mk. 1:15), nicht als ein zweites das er verlangt, sondern als Entfaltung der positiven Seite der *metanoia*, der Hinwendung zu Gott. Die Umkehr im Sinne Jesu erschöpft sich nicht im Negativen, dem Bruch mit dem alten Wesen angesichts des drohenden eschatologischen Gerichts: sie umfasst die ganze Wandlung des Menschen, den die Gottesherrschaft in Anspruch nimmt, und schliesst die Begründung des neuen persönlichen Verhältnisses des Menschen zu Gott, der *pistis* mit ein. Umkehren, sich bekehren ist in einem alles, was der Anbruch der Gottesherrschaft vom Menschen verlangt." In short, for John, the Kingdom was coming, for the post-Easter Christian, the Kingdom was now breaking in. Certainly the author of the Shepherd of Hermas thought along these same lines. In the third book of the Similitudes (3.9.12) the author attempts to unravel one of his similes. He equates entry into a city with entering the Kingdom of God and says, "For if you desire to enter into a city, and that city is surrounded by a wall, and has but

salvation history-the 'here-and-now' inclusion into the Kingdom of God and the promise of participation at the future coming of Jesus. These crucial differences signal not only that Christian baptism held some inherent differences from the Johannine baptism, but also that the name of Jesus played a central a role in the rite-in contrast to John's baptism, which evidently did not use any name. What conclusions may we than draw given the connection between John's baptism and Christian baptism, while simultaneously retaining the recognition that Christian baptism was something novel?

First, it seems clear that the early Christian faith appropriated the original Johannine baptism and infused it with new meaning. Here the early Christians, *by baptizing into the name of Jesus*, have transformed the Johannine baptism and made Jesus the frame of reference for the baptismal rite (that is, it is executed with respect to Jesus).¹⁰⁰⁰ It is also surely significant that the predecessor to this baptism was a *metanoia* that was brought about by proclaiming the apostolic kerygma (indeed it was predicated upon Jesus' ministry and mediated through Jesus' name),¹⁰⁰¹ which was preached *in the name of Jesus* and secured by adherence to his original message of the Kingdom.

Now, Hartman has promoted the view that the resurrection of Jesus clothed the rite with an electric eschatological element.¹⁰⁰² More specifically, the resurrection points to vindication and the Christian belief that Jesus was the coming Son of Man (the primitive Christian

one gate, can you enter into that city save through the gate which it has? "“Why, how can it be otherwise, sir? ”I said. “If, then, you cannot enter into the city except through its gate, so, in like manner, a man cannot otherwise enter into the kingdom of God *than by the name of His beloved Son* (δία τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἐνδόξου ὀνόματος) [emphasis mine].”

¹⁰⁰⁰ As Hartman puts it, “The phrase then characterizes the rite in a fundamental way; it was a ‘Jesus baptism’.” From the examples Hartman culled from his sources he was able to delineate three basic meanings of the baptismal phrase: 1) The action takes place “with respect to” a thing or person; 2) the action takes place “with respect to” things expressed in abstract nouns; 3) the action takes place “regarding” persons, namely men, as well as beings belonging in the divine sphere who are not engaged as agents in the action described by the verb. Hartman takes up another thread when he points out that the expression, “into the name of someone”, can often bear the connotation of partitive action or separateness. As evidence for this claim Hartman adduces the phrase in *b. Av. Zar. iii, 13*, where the Samaritans are said to perform circumcision, “into the name of Mt. Gerizim,” whereas the Jews perform circumcision, “into the name of the covenant.” Thus, within the context of the intra-muros schism between the adherents of the Baptist and those of Jesus the use of the phrase, ‘in the name of Jesus,’ would signify that Christian baptism was now to be distinguished from John’s baptism. For more details see Hartman, “In the Name of Jesus,” 437-439. See also *Auf den Namen des Herrn Jesus*, 134 and “Baptism ‘Into the Name of Jesus’ and Early Christology,” *Studia Theologia*, 28 (1974): 27-28.

¹⁰⁰¹ Hartman, “Baptism ‘Into the Name of Jesus’ and Early Christology,” 35, 41.

¹⁰⁰² *Ibid.*, 37. As Betz notes the Pauline phrase, Χριστὸν ἐνδύειν, surely signifies a divine dynamic of transformation. See Betz, *Galatians*, 187.

Naherwartung). We would do well at this point to allow Hartman to summarize this final turn in his own hermeneutical argument:

A Christology in Son of Man terms seems to be one that fits well the facts that after Easter people were summoned to repent and be received (by Jesus) into the *Heilsgemeinde*, b) they expected the imminent Kingdom of God which included their own vindication, c) the gateway into that *Heilsgemeinde* and into that expectation was a baptism 'into the name of Jesus'; This means that a) and b) depended upon Jesus, who was regarded as vindicated after his death. This, in its turn, necessarily brings a Christology into the picture and prevents us from referring a), b), and c), to, e.g. a general apocalyptic-eschatological *Hochspannung*.¹⁰⁰³

If we follow this trail to its logical conclusion we see that this use of the name of Jesus *christologically* orients Christian baptism. This finding suggests that this christological placement of Jesus at the center of the cultic rite signifies that Jesus had now transcended human categories in the opinion of the Church.

Just how far removed from ordinary humans Jesus was thought to be can be gauged in the light of Old Testament conventions, where the very act of calling upon YHWH was equatable to worship of Him, as well as signaling that the person belonged to YHWH.¹⁰⁰⁴ From this one may conclude that a similar situation now existed with respect to Jesus.¹⁰⁰⁵ Of course this calling out of the name of Jesus during baptism signaled that the baptizand acknowledged that Jesus was both Christ and Lord. Indeed, as I Cor. 6:11 strongly intimates, prior to baptism the baptizand was impure and sinful; therefore they belonged to "dem Machtbereich dieses [their prior] Gottes."¹⁰⁰⁶ This reality also therefore means that after baptism the baptizand was now under Christ's sphere of power. Hartman aptly formulates this relationship between baptism and Christ in the following fashion:

Wenn man von der...Taufe auf den Namen des Herrn Jesus gesprochen hat, hat der Ausdruck einen Inhalt erhalten, nach dem der 'Herr Jesus' dieselbe Bedeutung für die Taufe hat wie 'der Name' [i.e., as a circumlocution for God] oder 'der Himmel' für den Gottesdienst, die Versammlung, das Opfer oder die Gelübde,Dort wurden die genannten Riten im Rahmen des Dienstes von Gott ausgeführt und im Lichte seiner Bedeutung für sein Volk. *Hier wird etwas ähnliches vom Herrn Jesus gesagt. Der Name*

¹⁰⁰³ Hartman, "Baptism 'Into the Name of Jesus' and Early Christology," 39.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 255.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Heitmüller was not alone on this score. Jacob too inclined in this direction, as did Nägelsbach. See *DNGJHS*, 73 and *ING*, 62.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Hartman's wording. Hartman, *Auf den Namen des Herrn*, 83.

*hat in allen diesen Fällen die Gottheit angegeben, die die Voraussetzung des Ritus ist und deren Taten und Macht der Referenzrahmen sind...[emphasis mine].*¹⁰⁰⁷

Hartman is clearly following the correct trail when he notes with respect to cultic rites in general in antiquity that “Sie [cultic rites] werden „auf den Namen“ der Gottheit ausgeführt, der der Ritus gilt oder mit der er verbunden wird. Die betreffende Gottheit ist eine grundlegende Referenz des Ritus.”¹⁰⁰⁸ To bring out the implications of this further I need to unpack this statement of Hartman just a bit more.

First, we should remember that Jewish scruples mandated that the invocation of the Tetragrammaton alone occur exclusively within cultic settings and the occupation of this same ‘sacred space’ by the name of Jesus naturally has profound christological implications. It is impossible to exaggerate the fact that within Judaism it was YHWH who authorized and generated every cultic act—indeed every holy object or act stemmed from Him.¹⁰⁰⁹ In this context Mowinckel justly coined the truism with respect to cultic acts that “Hinter diesen Handlungen steht die Gottheit selbst...”¹⁰¹⁰ This truism then must be taken to also infer that it is the risen Jesus who stands behind the ritual. In light of this evidence it seems certain that Jesus was the frame of reference for baptism because he was the bearer of salvation. He was also the referent because it was believed that Jesus was part of the divine identity; indeed, he was the historical manifestation of God.

In summary, baptism was an eschatological event that saved the baptizand from God’s imminent visitation, and transferred the baptizand to the sphere of Jesus’ power and protection. This aspect of transference is also seen in those references which speak of the baptizand becoming incorporated into the Kingdom of Jesus.

Baptism also served to bring the baptizand into conformity with the sufferings and vindication that characterized Jesus’ life, death, and resurrection. Because every Christian had conformed to this pattern through baptism, they were now all one, members of the chosen redeemed (eschatological) people of God. And all of these remarkable events and

¹⁰⁰⁷ Ibid., 45f..

¹⁰⁰⁸ Ibid., 44.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Mowinckel, *Kultus*, 45.

¹⁰¹⁰ Ibid.

transformations were accomplished *in* the name of Jesus.

With my section on the phenomenological review finished, I shall now take up what this study reveals to us about the christological beliefs of the early Christians.

CHAPTER SIX

THE RITUAL USE OF THE NAME OF JESUS, EMERGENT BINITARIAN CHRISTOLOGY, AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Je bedeutender, ungewöhnlicher ein Person ist,...um so wirkungskräftiger ist auch sein Name, um so mehr Heil oder Unheil strahlt von ihm aus.¹⁰¹¹

Before I attempt to answer how the name-concept contributes to our understanding of the process of christological development, it is worth pointing out that the real difference between cultus and magic is not to be found in ὁρώμενον (i.e., performed acts), but in the far more significant λεγόμενον (i.e., the spoken word). Actions such as prayer, intercession, offering of worship, are found as a matter of course in almost all cults and do not offer us much help in distinguishing the most salient differences between various systems of belief. For example, on the outside magical invocation appears similar to ritual prayer; the magical invocation for blessing is similar to the priest calling out God's name over the children of Israel. We must look at what words were employed, or in the case of my study, what name was invoked to help us unlock the significance of ritual actions in early Christianity.

Upon sifting through the data on the early Christian use of the name of Jesus, as well as a fair amount of reflection on the meaning of the name of Jesus, several firm conclusions can be drawn. I shall address the group of passages which contain reflection first.

It is evident that in those passages which take up reflection over the significance of the name of Jesus that several major functions were served. One of the most significant functions was to express the somewhat ill-defined belief that Jesus must be included in the divine identity. Passages which speak of Jesus having received the divine name (Phil. 2:9), divine names/titles (Rev. 19: 11, 16), or the name 'Son' (Heb. 1:4), all serve to support the belief that Jesus was a part of the divine formulation. By staking out the claim that Jesus had received either the divine name, or at least another divine name (i.e., the Son of God), the earliest Christians could express their conviction that Jesus not only belonged in the divine reality, but furthermore, that since the bestowal of the name(s) came by the hand of God this recognition of the incorporation of Jesus into the divine identity was prompted by God Himself. The earliest Christians accordingly saw themselves not as violators of Jewish monotheistic scruples, but rather as a group who

¹⁰¹¹ Otto Eissfeldt, "Jahwe-Name und Zauberesen," 153.

recognized that God had revealed in some fashion that the divine identity included Jesus. The earliest Christians certainly found this belief difficult to understand and were no doubt pained when attempting to work out this complex 'divine identity' from a rational point of view, but they nonetheless believed that it was true. We can see in these passages not only the conviction that Jesus was a part of the divine identity, but also that these passages, and the christology which undergirds them, served as the provision for the defense that the Church had not departed from monotheism.

Another function which this reflection provided was to serve as a signpost for who Jesus was in terms of his ministry and mission. Passages such as Matt. 1:18 clearly reflect the concern to alert the readers that Jesus was a divinely ordained prophet and messiah whose ministry would bring about the ultimate salvation of those who allied themselves with Jesus.

A different function is served by Acts 2:38. Here the name of Jesus functions in several ways. First, it served to establish that Jesus was the divinely ordained intermediary between God and man. Only by calling upon God's ordained prophet, messiah, and Son, could one receive salvation from the coming wrath of God. The early Church clearly viewed the name of Jesus as an object of faith in the sense that to have faith in the salvific work of Jesus entailed also having faith that his name *alone* could usher in salvation. Jesus' name functions almost like a door; it allows entry into the divine family where God Himself provides protection for His people. This use of the name of Jesus also makes it clear that the early Christians believed that in some fashion Jesus was part of the divine identity. Numerous lines of evidence converge in support of this conclusion.

One evidence for this conclusion comes from the nature of confession, for confession served to highlight the core beliefs of the community. The fact that the earliest Christians could confess the name of Jesus means that they believed that Jesus was part of the divine identity and was worthy of acknowledgment. It is also clear that the earliest Christians confessed the name of Jesus because they believed that this brought glory to God; in fact, in their view God mandated this confession.

Now, in terms of the power of the name of Jesus it may be said that the implementation of the name of Jesus in exorcisms, healings, and other related phenomenon, signaled a clear shift to a new paradigm which incorporated significant christological features; that is, the use of the name of Jesus as a numinous name *par excellence* serves as an indication that he had been

elevated to a position over all creation in the opinion of the early Christians. This use of the name of Jesus is in keeping with the claims of the early Christians who speak of Jesus' elevation to a position of power over all beings. Indeed, the fact that the earliest Christians invoke *only* the name of Jesus to perform miracles and exorcisms indicates that they felt that Jesus was above all other earthly and spiritual powers; that is to say, Jesus was somehow an indispensable component of the divine reality.

When we turn to the use of the name of Jesus in baptism we find another strong indication that the earliest Christians felt that Jesus' name was above all other names. Indeed, the fact that this entire rite had to be carried out during the calling out of the name of Jesus is one of the most christologically pregnant actions of the early Christians. We know that Christian baptism is a christologically-reworked version of the baptism of John. The most obvious and important aspect of this christological revision is the use of the name of Jesus in the Christian rite. By utilizing the name of Jesus the rite was oriented toward Jesus himself. Thus, Jesus was the referent for the rite. Never before in the history of Judaism had a rite of inclusion into the people of God included the name of any intermediary being, angel, or historical person-no matter how exalted. It seems plausible, therefore, in the light of this singular use of the name of a historical person to suggest that the earliest Christians did not see Jesus in simply human terms. This in turn suggests that the earliest Christians had come to the conclusion that Jesus was part of the divine identity and that he was the historical manifestation of God. It was this realization, and the fact that Jesus had provided for the very salvation which they enjoyed, that allowed Jesus' name to be used in the rite of baptism. Indeed, because Jesus was seen as part of the divine identity Christians could belong to Jesus just as a Jew could belong to God. In the mind of the earliest Christians belonging to Jesus was something commanded by God and believed to bring God glory and honor, for it was God who had orchestrated the entire Christ-event.

It is also worth calling to mind the fact that invocation in a cultic setting had always been reserved for God alone in Jewish piety. The similar invocation of the name of Jesus within the Christian cult clearly invites comparison to the invocation of God in Jewish cultic settings and signifies that Jesus had transcended normal human categories in the view of the earliest Christians. Thus, in one of the most important acts of religiosity; that is, in cultic acts, the name of Jesus stood alone. This is yet another strong signal that the earliest Christians felt that Jesus shared in the divine identity.

This study also demonstrates that part of this reformulation of the divine identity to include Jesus was driven by the practice of transferring Old Testament YHWH texts/titles to Jesus. This accommodation also included the transference of certain divine prerogatives and attributes.

For some, this accommodation included the belief that Jesus was in some sense the historical manifestation of the *name* of God. As a natural and inevitable corollary this accommodation also included the integration of Jesus at the center of the Christian cult, and his name therefore became the focal point of cultic activities.

Finally, I should take a moment to explain how the name of Jesus related to the name YHWH in early Christianity. First, in my judgment, we can speak of a belief that Jesus' name had been elevated to a plane which in the past had been reserved for 'YHWH' alone. This elevation was believed to have been instituted by God, and a part of this exaltation was that God had also exalted Jesus' name. Jesus' name, and Jesus' name alone, was now *the* 'name of power' that was to be invoked in times of spiritual conflict. This sole emphasis on Jesus' name was believed to bring God glory because it was the fruition of the work which He had accomplished in Christ.

In summary, this survey demonstrates that the earliest Christians used the name of Jesus in a manner which suggests that they believed that Jesus was in some fashion divine. Jesus was not just a mediator figure, or a messenger. In their view he was somehow a manifestation of the divine reality. The earliest Christians utilized the name of Jesus in a manner strikingly similar to Jews who employed the name of God in various ritual settings and in many other activities. This overlap is nearly total. Exceptions to this rule seem to be readily explained by the absence of any occasion in the New Testament documents whereby the various authors needed to use the name of Jesus in a particular fashion.

Furthermore, it must be pointed out once again that it is of the utmost significance that in stark contrast to the normative application of *numerous* divine names in Greco-Roman magic and religion, the earliest Christian praxis was to apply Jesus' name *alone* in effecting healings, exorcisms, miracles, cultic functions, salvation, revelation, and providing access to God. Even within the Church itself, never are the names of the apostles placed in apposition with Jesus' name, nor are they said to be mediums of exchange in the divine economy. Not only is Jesus' name applied across the entire spectrum of activities, but we must also recognize that Jesus' name

is utilized without escort with the names of other principal divine agents (angelic beings for example), including even the name YHWH. For the early Christians, Jesus' name bore the divine *exousia*, *dynamis*, and *doxa*. This study demonstrates that the earliest Christians felt obligated to accept that the prerogatives and divine predications which belonged to the Name must now be shared with the name of Jesus. This absolute use of the name of Jesus by the early Church unquestionably reveals a profound binitarian christology which implies the elevation of Jesus over the entire created order, seen and unseen. In brief, the evidence strongly shows that the use of the name of Jesus by the earliest Christians provides strong, "on the ground" proof, so to speak, that the earliest Christians believed that Jesus must be recognized as part of the divine reality.

Now, this elevation of the name of Jesus to such rarified status testifies to a profound 'high' christology on the part of the early Church. Perhaps most astoundingly we have also observed that this supplanting of the name of YHWH by the name of Jesus seemingly occurred *from the very outset of the Christian faith*. This last point cannot be overstated for the issue of chronology has been a central focus in the debate over 'high' christology. In the mind of some, a 'high' christology at a relatively late date (ca. 80-100 C.E.) would imply an evolutionary development and free the early Church from charges of binitheism. Along with other studies, the results of this study will help to clear up this ongoing debate.

In conclusion, this review of the name-concept in terms of the early Church has put us in the center of a profound christological development. Simply put, for the early Christian the name of Jesus occupied all 'divine space'; that is, it was at the center of the cult and it was the spiritual authority and power over the entire cosmos. This hegemony over all divine space unmistakably testifies that a high christology was imprinted upon the shape of early Christ-devotion.

APPENDIX ONE

BACKGROUND TO PHILIPPIANS 2:6-11

There have been many attempts to uncover the background of the hymn but to date none have met with universal approval. In order to appreciate this fact I introduce here the major attempts which have been undertaken for understanding the background for the hymn.

Certainly the most influential study yet produced on the hymn was the seminal study of Ernst Lohmeyer in his *Kyrios Jesus*. Lohmeyer's work inaugurated the modern study of the passage by conclusively demonstrating that the verses have a poetic 'hymnic' quality which separates them from the larger context in which they are found. Lohmeyer believed that the historical backdrop to the hymn's production is found in the nascent theology of the Palestinian mother church (or maybe Antioch or Damascus)¹⁰¹² and pressed into service in cultic settings, esp. the Eucharist. While useful in numerous ways, Lohmeyer's study did not explain why Isa. 45:23 was specifically incorporated into the hymn.

Another notable model proposed an *Urmench*-redeemer background to the hymn. E. Käsemann championed this view and saw the figure in *Corp. Herm.* 1:13-14 as forming the most proximal backdrop for the Philippians hymn.¹⁰¹³ There the primal man is said to be like God and even to display the form of God. Käsemann saw vv. 6-8 as describing the subjection of Jesus to the hostile cosmic powers (a theme embraced by the Hermetic literature), while vv. 9-10 detailed Christ's victory over these powers. Unlike Lohmeyer, who attached a Palestinian provenance to his theory on the creation of the hymn, Käsemann saw the hymn as having a Hellenistic provenance.

Against this position however D. Georgi has persuasively argued that key elements of the *Urmench*-redeemer myth are absent in the hymn. There are, for example, no obvious conflicts between the redeemer and powers neither of the cosmos, nor between believers and the cosmic powers who would seek to hinder them. Furthermore, the existence of the redeemer in his pre-temporal state is nowhere mentioned.¹⁰¹⁴ Moreover, there is no mention of the redeemed, an

¹⁰¹² *KJ*, 73.

¹⁰¹³ See Käsemann's, "Kritische Analyse." Wengst, too, persuaded by Käsemann's work, adhered to this model. See *Christologische Formeln*, 146-147.

¹⁰¹⁴ Jesus' state is framed with respect to his former divine place and does not expressly bring out Jesus' pre-temporal existence except by extension.

integral component of the Gnostic Redeemer myth. Nagata has chimed in and added that the apparent reference to an actual incarnation in verse 7, and the investiture of the greatest honors inclusive of the 'name above every name' (v. 9), are unparalleled in the Gnostic redeemer myth.¹⁰¹⁵ Indeed, it is this last respect, exaltation and universal acclamation, that the Gnostic redeemer myth most misses the mark by offering no analog. Moreover, in the Redeemer myth it is the Redeemer himself who rises by virtue of his own power, while in the hymn it is God who is the subject of the action. Besides these objections the proposition of a well-developed Gnostic myth in pre-Christian times is rather dubious, to say the least. Käsemann, to his credit, rejected his proposal shortly after he issued it and it remains only as a historical footnote.

Another proposed background is that Jewish Wisdom speculation forms the backdrop to the hymn. D. Georgi is perhaps its best-known champion.¹⁰¹⁶ This background envisions the suitable figure to be the Righteous One who is chosen as a divine instrument. Examples of this motif are drawn from the Wisdom of Solomon where the Righteous One lacks any individual traits and is clearly only a figurehead intended to bring to the fore the characteristics of righteousness. To bring out the comparison between the Righteous One and the figure depicted in Phil. 2:5-11, I need to create the outline of the Righteous One.

One of the most prominent features within Wisdom tradition is that the Righteous One is said to fall upon evil times (Wis. 3: 4-6), but is later vindicated by God. This would, in the mind of its advocates, of course correspond to Jesus' death and resurrection. Other points of contact would be Phil. 2:8 and Wisdom 5:1,16, where in both texts the figures are exalted due to their obedience.¹⁰¹⁷

Georgi's hypothesis falls wide of the mark however when it is observed that in Hellenistic Judaism pre-existent Wisdom has as its most characteristic role that of mediator in creation, or in sustaining its continued existence, a role not attested in the hymn.¹⁰¹⁸ Nor is there mention of any sending or any reference to descending. It is also meaningful that Wisdom is

¹⁰¹⁵ Nagata, *Philippians 2:6-11*, 204.

¹⁰¹⁶ See Dieter Georgi, "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2,6-11," in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtsag*, ed. Erich Dinkler, (Tübingen:, J.C.B. Mohr, 1964), 263-293.

¹⁰¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 274.

¹⁰¹⁸ Nagata, *Phil. 2:5-11*, 304-305.

never referred to, or even conceived of, as a righteous sufferer in obedience to God (i.e., Wis. 5:16 refers to the righteous, not Wisdom).¹⁰¹⁹ In addition, the term *μορφὴ θεοῦ*, with its antithetical juxtaposition alongside *μορφὴ δουλοῦ*, is hardly an appropriate cognate term for the traditional Wisdom expression *εἰκὼν θεοῦ*.¹⁰²⁰ Finally, but by no means the least of the numerous objections which beset the theory is the problem which arises when we catalog the varied traits which Wisdom possesses in the tradition. Here we find yet another stumbling block, for we see that it is Wisdom that is said to preexist and come to earth, not the Righteous One.

Another contender is that of the Ebed-YHWH figure of Deutero-Isaiah, a view put forward by L. Cerfaux,¹⁰²¹ J. Jeremias,¹⁰²² M. Rissi,¹⁰²³ and most recently by R. Bauckham.¹⁰²⁴ Advocates point out that the phrase ‘taking the form of a slave’ would seem to reflect the Ebed figure, while the phrase ‘he emptied himself,’ points to Isa. 53: 12, where the Servant is said to have, “poured out his soul [unto death].”

The validity of this stance has been challenged on numerous grounds, not the least of which is that there are no absolute verbal correspondences between the hymn and the Suffering Servant spoken of in Isaiah. For example, the use of *μορφὴν δούλου* contains no direct echo of the term *παῖς* which is employed in the Servant Songs.¹⁰²⁵ In a similar vein Bornkamm has objected that

¹⁰¹⁹ So Gnllka, *Die Philipperbrief*, 143.

¹⁰²⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰²¹ “L’hymne au Christ-Serviteur de Dieu (Phil. 2,6-11=Is 52,13-53,12),” in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux. Vol. II. Etudes d’Exégèse et d’Histoire Religieuse*, (Gembloux: éditions J. Ducolot, 1954): 425-437. Lohmeyer had already pointed to a number of informal points of correspondence between the Ebed-YHWH and the figure described in the hymn, see page 33, 69, and especially page 36 of *K.J.*

¹⁰²² See Joachim Jeremias, “Zur Gedankenführung in den Paulinischen Briefen, Christushymnus Phil. 2:6-11,” 146-154.

¹⁰²³ Rissi challenges, among other things, the concessive sense of the participle *ὑπάρχων* (preferring a modal or casual sense). He also sees *ἀρπαγμός* as meaning not grasping after deity, but simply desire. See Mathias Rissi, “Der Christushymnus in Phil 2,6-11,” *Aufstieg und Niedergang in der Römischen Welt, Religion*, 25.4 (1987): 3315-3326.

¹⁰²⁴ Bauckham, “The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11,” 128-139. Bauckham argues that the inclusion of Isa. 45:23 can be explained by seeing the hymn as a christological reworking of Deutero-Isaiah. Bauckham’s proposal ultimately must patch together both Servant Song material and those which have God as the subject to account for the use of Isa. 45:23.

¹⁰²⁵ Strimple however notes that other allusions to the Servant Songs in the Synoptic Gospels appear to be based on an ancient translation of the Hebrew text independent of the one utilized for the translation of the Septuagint. Additionally, Rissi maintains that these two phrases are the same, basing this judgment on lexicons. One

the original phrases ‘his soul’ and ‘unto death’ could have scarcely been ignored by the author of the hymn if it had been his intention to draw upon Ebed imagery.¹⁰²⁶

Perhaps the most telling objection that can be leveled at this position is the lack of specific soteriological elaboration at precisely those points where such elaboration would be expected.¹⁰²⁷ As Lohmeyer states, “Nirgends ist hier von Gläubigen oder einer Unterscheidung von Gemeinde und Welt die Rede, nur das Bild eines göttlichen Geschehens und seines Trägers ist hier gezeichnet....”¹⁰²⁸ This lack of soteriological focus is disturbing given that the Ebed-YHWH’s suffering is intimately bound up with forgiveness of transgressions.

Further difficulties are raised when one asks why, if the hymn is reflective of Ebed-YHWH imagery, does the citation of Isa. 45:23 come from a section which does not concern him?¹⁰²⁹ As if this is not enough to indicate that this is a false trail, additional obstacles surface when we consider the claims of preexistence, a notion which is completely foreign to the Ebed-YHWH tradition.¹⁰³⁰ Finally, advocates of this view are forced to accept that *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν* is a reference to the crucifixion.¹⁰³¹ This proposal is strained to say the least as the phrase is more naturally seen as referring to the incarnation. Although the Ebed-YHWH proposal displays

can raise the objection though that if the terms have no substantive differences in their respective semantic fields than one is prompted to ask why the author of the hymn, if indeed his purpose was to recall the image of the Suffering Servant, did he not use *εἰκὼν* in order to more exactly reflect the terminology of the Septuagintal text? See R. B. Strimple, “Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Studies: Some Exegetical Conclusions,” *WTJ* 41 (1979): 247-268, and Rissi, “Der Christushymnus,” 3317. For a brief but helpful review see also O’Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, 268-271.

¹⁰²⁶ As quoted in O’Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, 269.

¹⁰²⁷ Rissi has noted this lack of elaboration but dismisses this absence as simply an unnecessary addition. But the case stands quite to the contrary, for the peculiar absence of this elaboration is a formidable obstacle to his formulation (cf. Heb 1:3b). Nagata also notes, “...the hymn omits explicit references to soteriological significance, even at those points where the hymn could elaborate on it.” I would emend Nagata’s statement to say that the hymn does not take up soteriological themes where the hymn *should* have done so. Schenk is of a similar opinion. See Wolfgang Schenk, “Der Philipperbrief in der neueren Forschung (1945-1985),” *Aufstieg und Niedergang in der Römischen Welt, Religion*, Principat 25.4, ed. W. Hasse (1987): 3301. Also Hofius, “Der Christushymnus,” 3319, and Nagata, *Phil.* 2:5-11, 335-336.

¹⁰²⁸ Lohmeyer, *KJ*, 85. See also Reinhard Deichgraber, *Gottes hymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit. Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 119 and Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief*, 141.

¹⁰²⁹ Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief*, 141.

¹⁰³⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰³¹ Jeremias, *Studia Paulina*, 154 n.3. As quoted in O’Brien, *Philippians*, 220.

flickers of genius it ultimately fails to convince, and this had led some scholars to attempt a more promising formulation.

In an effort to bypass the troubles which beset the figure of the Ebed-YHWH Eduard Schweizer proposed that the most suitable background is that of the righteous sufferer, a motif well-attested in post-biblical Judaism. The motif draws primarily from Jewish martyrology of the Maccabean period and offers to side-step the difficulties of the Ebed-YHWH servant proposal, since it requires no formal verbal correspondence between the Servant Songs and the hymn and yet takes on board many of the motifs which are found in the Servant Songs. Schweizer draws attention to the fact that the obedient servant embodies the suffering and humiliation for the Jewish faith as seen in light of the Maccabean revolt. This martyr for the faith was also expected to be vindicated by God, especially in eschatological terms, and this, it is claimed, fits well with the claim of vindication within the hymn.

Significant problems arise however when we note that the righteous sufferer envisioned by Schweizer can hardly be described as a pre-existing figure who descends to earth. More problematic yet is that no martyr figure is ever said to be exalted to the very right hand of God and granted the status of *kyrios* over all things.

An even more contemporary exegesis draws upon Genesis 1: 26-27 and 3: 1-5 to bring out a proposed first Adam-last Adam (or Second Adam) antithesis. The chief proponents of this view are O. Cullmann, J. H  ring and more recently, J. Dunn. These scholars add in support of their view that in various places in the New Testament we find clear intertextual echoes of Genesis 1 and 3, e.g., Rom. 5:18-19 and I Cor. 15: 45-47, where this sort of imagery is employed. This model proposes further that such expressions as $\epsilon\nu\ \mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ and $\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota\ \iota\varsigma\ \alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omega$ are very familiar first Adam-last Adam themes which are well attested in Philonic thought. Ultimately the whole scheme can be reduced to the basic notion that what the first Adam lost through his disobedience the second Adam recovered by means of his obedience. Dunn pushes this theme even further and suggests that the entire hymn recounts *only* the earthly life of Jesus, both in his abasement and his exaltation. In Dunn's view there is no reference to an incarnation here, nor any thought of a heavenly elevation.¹⁰³² Despite some interesting parallels

¹⁰³² James D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London/Philadelphia, 1980; 2nd ed., Grand Rapids, 1996), 114-121.

to Adamic motifs, recent research has cast doubt upon the validity of several pillars upon which the model rests.

First, the term **μορφῇ** is not an appropriate cognate term for the traditional Wisdom and biblical expression **εἰκών**, and their presumed interchangeability, has been rightly challenged.¹⁰³³ Dunn complains however that this misses the point, allusion, he maintains, by its very nature is non-specific and does not require a one-to-one correspondence to the thing that it alludes to.¹⁰³⁴ Dunn nonetheless feels the need to explain this choice and puts forward the thought that **μορφῇν δούλου** was chosen so that the reader can see that Jesus had really become a slave, he was not just *like* a slave.¹⁰³⁵ Hurst alertly fires back that if this was the case then why should the expression **ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ** not be taken to imply that Jesus was *really* in the form of God, not just *like* God?¹⁰³⁶ Dunn also appears to undercut his own argument here, for if the art of allusion is subtlety and lack of precision then why the selection of the more precise **μορφῇν δούλου**?¹⁰³⁷ Why then too, if allusion did matter, did the author not make an even more direct allusion by using the Adamic **εἰκών** terminology?

The case against Dunn is brought along further by Colin Brown, who has called attention to the difference between these terms by observing that **μορφῇ** carries the thought of visible appearance while **εἰκών** is more vague.¹⁰³⁸ Drawing out the implications of this a bit further Brown comments, "While the biblical Adam was the image of God, he was not the visible appearance of God or the form which God took."¹⁰³⁹ Related to this is O'Brien's observation that the proposed interchangeability thesis stumbles badly when it is noted that the compound

¹⁰³³ For references see O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, 263 fn. 7.

¹⁰³⁴ James D.G. Dunn, "Christ, Adam, and Preexistence," in *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*, eds. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd. (Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 75.

¹⁰³⁵ Dunn, *Christology*, 311fn 70.

¹⁰³⁶ Lincoln D. Hurst, "Christ, Adam, and Preexistence Revisited," in *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*, eds. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd, (Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 85.

¹⁰³⁷ *Ibid.*, 89.

¹⁰³⁸ See Brown, "Ernst Lohmeyer's *Kyrios Jesus*," 27.

¹⁰³⁹ *Ibid.*

μορφὴν δούλου cannot readily be understood as a synonym for εἰκὼν δούλου.¹⁰⁴⁰

O'Brien further draws attention to the fact that the phrase in verse 7 καὶ σχήματι εὔρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος is a curious expression for someone who, following Adamic patterns, would have always existed as a man and the contrast itself which draws upon existence, 'in the form of God,' and existence, 'in the form of a human,' scarcely makes sense if a purely earthy sketch of Jesus' life actually lay before us.¹⁰⁴¹

Another problem for the non-incarnational view arises if we accept that the passage should be viewed in light of other Pauline 'sending' passages such as Gal. 4:4 and Rom. 8: 3 (e.g., I Cor. 8: 3; Hebrews 1: 3; Colossians 1: 15-20), which clearly demonstrate, in my opinion, that Paul held to a doctrine of preexistence. It seems scarcely believable that Paul would utilize this hymn if he understood it to be at variance with his own theology. All of the above considerations point us in the direction of concluding that Phil. 2: 6-11 implies an incarnation, and this belief is not attested in Adamic thought.

Another impediment to accepting the Adamic model is that the whole notion of Jesus not seizing what Adam had (i.e., equality with God) has no discernable mechanism for its accomplishment. This statement might perhaps seem cryptic, but what I mean is this: unlike the Genesis account, the Philippians hymn gives no hint as to how Jesus could have 'seized' divine equality if no pretemporal divine state was contemplated by the author.¹⁰⁴² Adam had the possibility of eating from the Tree of Knowledge, but by what mechanism might Jesus attain to the divine prerogatives? This question Dunn leaves unanswered.

Further problems for Dunn's thesis appear when we look closely at the verbs employed in the first section of the hymn. Dunn maintains, as he must, that the hymn does not speak of a point in time in which Jesus became human, but instead should be read as encompassing Jesus'

¹⁰⁴⁰ O'Brien, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 264.

¹⁰⁴¹ O'Brien, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 267 and Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus*, 124.

¹⁰⁴² Wanamaker has remarked, "He [Dunn] maintains that Christ as the Second Adam, 'faced the same archetypal choice that confronted Adam.' But unlike Adam, Christ 'chose to empty himself of Adam's glory and to embrace Adam's lot,' namely man's slavery 'to corruption and the powers.' This view lacks coherence, however, because Dunn gives no account of what glory Christ could have had which was not available to other men and how he surrendered it up. In effect Dunn mythologizes the humanity of Christ by making him qualitatively different from the rest of humanity without any explanation of the origin of the supposed difference. Dunn does not seem to realize that it was precisely this problem which the idea of Christ's pre-existence explained for Paul." As quoted in Hofius, *Der Christushymnus*, 114. Original quote comes from C.A. Wanamaker, "Philippians 2:6-11: Son of God or Adamic Christology?," *NTS* 33 (1987), 182.

human life taken altogether. But this proposal runs counter to the natural sense of the verbs for the hymn begins with a present participle ὑπάρχων, when referring to Jesus being in the form of God, while shortly thereafter, when seeming to speak of an incarnation, we come across the aorist participle λαβών and γενόμενος. This tense change would seem to strongly indicate that a literal point in time is meant.¹⁰⁴³

Additionally, if the hymn is following established Adamic conventions, then Dunn's proposal is washed up yet again against the rocks of reason when we recall that Adam is nowhere said to be exalted in the way that Jesus is. Dunn's response to this objection appeals to drawing a parallel between Phil. 2: 6-11 and I Cor. 15: 24-28, where an allusion to Ps. 8:6 is found (15:27), coming just after the Adam-Christ contrast of 15: 21-22.¹⁰⁴⁴ Dunn also calls upon the fact that Adam receives glorification in several works including the *Life of Adam and Eve*, *Apocalypse of Moses* 37, and *Testament of Abraham* A 11. Dunn's arguments fails to persuade, however, for the degree of exaltation is nowhere close to being equal between Adam and Jesus. Jesus receives the divine name, universal acclamation, and is installed as the *kyrios* over all things.¹⁰⁴⁵ Dunn makes no attempt to explain the difference between Jesus' exaltation to divine status and Adam's more limited glorification.

Finally, two other considerations need to be added to this catalog of objections. First, the hymn seems to be utilizing common New Testament themes which are attested elsewhere. For example, the claim found in Heb. 1: 3 that Jesus is the "radiance of His glory and the exact representation of His nature" appears to form a near perfect analog to the hymn's statement that Jesus was ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων. Likewise the claim that Jesus emptied himself and then humbled himself, and was later glorified, sounds apparently clear echoes to Heb. 2:9 which says of Jesus, "But we do see Him who has been made for a little while lower than the angels, namely, Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace

¹⁰⁴³ Gerald F. Hawthorne, "In the Form of God and Equal with God (Philippians 2:6)," in *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*, eds. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd, (Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 97.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Ibid., 77.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Hofius rightly questions whether the author could have believed that a mere human, no matter how obedient and righteous, could ever be worthy of receiving the divine name. He also correctly points out that the very section of Isaiah that the author employs contains the statement that God's name is for him alone (Isa. 42:8). This would seem to exclude Dunn's vision of a purely human Jesus. See Hofius, *Der Christushymnus*, 115.

of God He might taste death for everyone.” The granting of the highest name also seems to mirror the statement of Heb. 1:4 that Jesus was given the *διαφορώτερον ὄνομα*. In short, the theme of preexistence, abasement in becoming human, as well as obedience unto death, with a later vindication, replete with the bestowal of a higher name, finds ready parallel in the Epistle to the Hebrews. This suggests that the Philippians hymn orbits around many of the same (shared) christological themes that we find in Hebrews, rather than taking up the concerns and themes of Gen. 1. This congruence suggests a common tradition which both authors drew upon to compose their works. The fact that the conventional reading of Phil. 2:6-11 squares nicely with established New Testament categories can also be taken to suggest that the conventional understanding is closer the mark than Dunn’s synthesis.

Now another approach that has been advocated is that the hymn aims for the eschatological promise that at the end of time the universal revelation of YHWH and His rule would occur. We owe this proposal to the work of Otfried Hofius. What Hofius has brought to the table is the idea that this universal event entails not only recognition, but also actual worship by the entire cosmos. To this end, Hofius hopes to establish two facts: first, that the confession and the bowing of the knee in v. 9 signifies worship and not simple acknowledgement of the lordship of Christ, and second, that the terms *ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων* refer not to demonic or spiritual forces hostile to God, but rather that this collocation of terms denotes in a comprehensive fashion the three cosmic spheres and thus point to the universality of this projected worship.¹⁰⁴⁶

Hofius’ reconstruction has much to commend it, particularly his proposal of universal acknowledgement (rather than acknowledgement by demonic forces alone). But his reconstruction does not do justice to the very peculiar use of Is. 45:23. Also, in order to place on a firm foundation the claim that worship is meant when we read of the cry that ‘Jesus is Lord,’ Hofius must claim that this is *Anbetung* rather than confession. In spite of the fact that he highlights the confessional nature of the cry, he sees this cry as being synonymous with the meaning delivered in Rom. 10:12f., I Cor. 1:2 and Acts 9:14, 21. In order to achieve this he binds

¹⁰⁴⁶ Ruck-Schröder has observed that the terminology which we find in 2:10c, sounds very much like those Psalms in the LXX which speak of acknowledging the divine name (e.g., 21: 23; 28:2 and 148: 1-5,13). This would seem to preclude accepting the triad of 10c as referring to demonic powers. O’Brien proposes instead that the adjectives are masculine nouns and thus construes the phrase as denoting all rational beings who must make homage. In any event, he offers a helpful review and I refer the reader to this section of O’Brien’s work. See, *DNGJNT*, 72-73 for Ruck-Schröder and *Epistle to the Philippians*, 244 for O’Brien.

together ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ with the cry κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (for Hofius a *Huldigungsruf*).¹⁰⁴⁷ He then takes a rather huge leap by claiming that this proposed nexus is equal to ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα. This equation is simply untenable. As we have seen the ritual action of invoking the name of Jesus, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα, is a technical term for calling upon Jesus by his name. In contrast, the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι has another function altogether; that is, it has an instrumental function. To claim then, that they are equivalent is pushing the evidence beyond what it will bear.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Hofius, *Der Christushymnus*, 38, 51.

APPENDIX TWO

DEFINITION OF MAGIC

Magic is a term which casts many shadows. Attempts to define magic have long occupied scholars in the field and generated some controversy. For the sake of brevity I shall begin with the definition of David Aune rather than covering the previous attempts and then move forward. There are two reasons for starting with Aune.

First, at times it seems that there are almost as many definitions of magic as there are researchers in the field and this makes for a cumbersome analysis. The second reason for selecting Aune is that his essay helps mark a significant sea change in the way we view the relationship between magic and religion. Earlier scholarship had subscribed to the view that magic and religion are so disparate that one must view them as categorically different entities rather than merely differing from one another by degrees. What Aune's article emphasizes is that magic and religion are in many respects simply two sides of the same coin; thus, magic cannot be viewed in a pejorative fashion, as was sometimes the custom among earlier scholars.

Another reason to emphasize Aune's work is that it has drawn considerable attention from other New Testament scholars as well as scholars of magic in general. With that said I will begin with Aune's definition.

Aune's formulation of magic runs as follows: 1) Magic and religion are so closely intertwined that it is virtually impossible to regard them as discrete socio-cultural categories; 2) The structural-functional analysis of magic-religious phenomena forbids a negative attitude toward magic; 3) Magic is a phenomenon that exists only within the matrix of particular religious traditions; magic is not religion only in the sense that a species is not a genus. A particular magical system coheres within a religious structure in the sense that it shares the fundamental religious reality construction of the contextual religion; 4) Magic appears to be as universal a feature of religion as deviant behavior is of human societies.¹⁰⁴⁸

Assessments such as Aune's have helped to lead to a shift away from the assumption that magic was usually marginalized and illicit in nature. One example of this shift is found in the work of Robert Ritner, who has correctly observed that in Egypt at least, so-called magical or occultic practices were not performed by the marginalized elements of society in defiance of

¹⁰⁴⁸David Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity," 1516.

societal norms. On the contrary, magic was the everyday practice of the priests and scribes, the “very source of tradition,” and magic was carried out under their aegis.¹⁰⁴⁹ In fact magic was believed to have been revealed by the gods themselves.¹⁰⁵⁰ Even the pharaohs engaged in its practice.¹⁰⁵¹ What I hope the reader takes away from these recent contributions is that magic and religion play off one another and are not necessarily antithetical to one another.

Another development that is germane to my analysis is the recent definition of Greco-Roman magic offered by Clinton Arnold. He has presented a more detailed definition of Greco-Roman magic—a definition with which I am in agreement. I offer here an abbreviated version of Arnold’s definition:

- 1) There is an identifiable form to the charms and spells...Most have the following elements; (a) a rite to perform, (b) an invocation...and (c) a statement of command...
- 2) That magic was perceived to guarantee results...
- 3) Magical documents have an array of terminology given specialized significance....
- 4) The documents invariably include a series of names...or characters...thought to be laden with power.¹⁰⁵²

Arnold’s definition is quite useful but for the purposes of my study; I would emphasize, however, that the central core of any definition of magic is the belief that the theurgist or practitioner of magic could compel the divinity *against its will*. By way of comparison, a prayer is performed by a worshiper of the divinity and is intended to request something from the divinity, but ultimately leaves the answer in the hands of the divinity. The prayer is offered in

¹⁰⁴⁹ Robert K. Ritner, “Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire: the Demotic Spells and their Religious Context,” *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, Part II, 18.2*, eds. Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 3354.

¹⁰⁵⁰ A.D. Nock, “Greek Magical Papyri,” in *Arthur Darby Nock: Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, Vol. 1*, Ed. Zeph Stewart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 188 (= *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 15 [1929]: 219-235). See also William Brashear, “The Greek Magical Papyri: an Introduction and Survey; Annotated Bibliography (1928-1994),” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt Part II, 18.2*, (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 3391.

¹⁰⁵¹ Ritner, “Egyptian Magical Practices,” 3354.

¹⁰⁵² Clinton Arnold, *The Colossian Syncretism. The Interface Between Christianity and Folk Belief at Colossae*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2 Reihe 77 (Tübingen : J.C.B. Mohr, 1995), 14-15.

submission to the deity and relies upon the beneficence of the deity for the answer.¹⁰⁵³ In contrast a magical act is something that seeks to bring, even force, the divinity into compliance through the intrinsic power of either the medium employed or the rituals that are carried out.¹⁰⁵⁴ Accordingly, for the purposes of this work I have defined magic *generally* as the belief that one could *compel* a divinity to answer the petition without necessarily seeking its volition. This conclusion is in keeping with the implications of Arnold's second point that magic was perceived to guarantee results.¹⁰⁵⁵ Thus, I have adhered to the other more specific points concerning Greco-Roman magic which Arnold has made.

¹⁰⁵³ My position does not deny that prayer, or some facsimile thereof, existed in magical circles. Fritz Graf has catalogued several excellent examples of this phenomenon. Still, as witnessed in the papyri, the normative process in attempting to move the gods was through magical technique. For further reading on prayers in magic consult Fritz Graf, "Prayers In Magical and Religious Ritual," in *MAGIKA HIERA, Ancient Greek Magic & Religion*, Eds. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink, (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 188-213. Also, it is worth drawing attention to the position of G. Luck, who has noted that arguably the greatest difference between magic and religion is simply this, "...praying for something, giving thanks for something, is conceivable in magic, but not the consciousness of sin and the prayer of forgiveness...". See Georg Luck, *Arcana Mundi. Magic and the Occult in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University, 1985), 5.

¹⁰⁵⁴ I recognize that this definition may appear too 'Frazerian,' but I hold nonetheless that the notion of coercion still allows us to distinguish between magic and religion, even though magic and religion oftentimes use the same ritualistic tools when approaching the supernatural. Some scholars, such as Graf, of course still recognize that coercion is a part of magic, but point out that it is not its sole characteristic. I concur, but as we have seen with divine names, all too often the notion of coercion enters into magical thinking. For a good review of the place of coercion in magical operations and thought see Fritz Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World*, trans. Franklin Philip (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997), 222-229.

¹⁰⁵⁵ For the interested reader I draw attention to the work of Fritz Graf, who devotes an interesting section to this question in his *Gottesnähe und Schadenzauber*. Like others, he concludes that compulsion or force of divine beings was an integral component of magic. See Fritz Graf, *Gottesnähe und Schadenzauber: die Magie in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, C.H. Beck Kulturwissenschaft (München, C.H. Beck, 1996), 198-201.

APPENDIX THREE

THE TERM HYPOSTASIS

As for the term hypostasis, it must be remarked that in the past this term has been liable to various abuses. The term itself is either often ill-defined, or in some cases, definitions have relied too heavily on the term as it came to be defined during Early Christian doctrinal disputes. Saul Olyan, a figure whom we shall encounter again momentarily, describes this situation well when he states "It is impossible to know the assumptions underlying each individual usage of these vexed expressions [i.e., hypostasis and hypostatization]. There are now many scholars who avoid entirely the use of the terms or redefine them..."¹⁰⁵⁶

To date, various attempts to provide a fuller and clearer description have fallen within three types.¹⁰⁵⁷ First comes the Bousset/Greifmann conception, which deemed a hypostasis as a *Mittelwesen* between God and the world and which made possible the display of God's power on the earth. This definition does not stray far from the notion which previous authors have offered.

Mowinkel weighs in next and registers the opinion that a hypostasis is "eine halb selbständige, halb als Offenbarungsform einer höheren Gottheit...die eine Personifizierung einer Eigenschaft...einer höheren Gottheit darstellt." Interestingly, Mowinkel's definition implies a more subtle and abstract view than the Bousset/Greifmann conception.

Finally, Ringgren takes up Mowinkel's definition and adds further refinements stating that a hypostasis is "eine oft nur halb selbständige göttliche Wesenheit, die eine mehr oder weniger durchgeführte Personifizierung einer Eigenschaft, einer Wirksamkeit, oder irgendeines Attributs...Oft ist die Grenze zwischen poetischer Personifizierung und eigentlicher Hypostasierung schwer zu ziehen." Naturally no one definition has proven to be suitable to everyone's satisfaction and the search for a suitable definition goes on.¹⁰⁵⁸

¹⁰⁵⁶ Saul Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: exegesis and the naming of angels in ancient Judaism*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 36, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1993), 90.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Gerhard Pfeifer, *Ursprung und Wesen der Hypostasenvorstellungen im Judentum* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1967), 14-16. All the references to the following quotations are found in Pfeifer's work.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Ibid. Pfeifer's description contains two parts. Pfeifer agrees with those who maintain that in relationship to the world a hypostasis acts in the manner and way of the divinity itself. Secondly, he posits that in part a hypostasis partakes in the nature and essence of the divinity. See pg. 15.

Whatever one may make of these various definitions, Ringgren's more cautious tone highlights a major conceptual problem in this field of study, viz. how one may answer the vexatious question of how to discriminate a hypostasis from mere poetic metaphor. For example, what criteria should we use when we encounter a figure in a text which seems to appear as a hypostasis?

Fortunately, recent progress has been made in this area. In this context I report the valuable contribution made by Olyan.¹⁰⁵⁹ Olyan has provided the immensely useful task of cleaning up and tightening up our understanding of this nebulous term, as well as offering a practical criterion for discriminating between a hypostasis and mere rhetorical flourishes that involve metaphors. In Olyan's schema there are two distinct categories for characterizing the 'hypostatic' attributes of a deity. The first category he terms "special figurative treatment." Olyan uses this term to describe the process which prior scholars had referred to as hypostatization.¹⁰⁶⁰ This category embraces all of those references to the deity, which emphasize the attributes or presence of the deity in symbolic or metaphorical terms; thus, references to the Arm of the Lord (e.g. Isa. 51:9-11), or the Wisdom of God (e.g. Prov. 8-9), or passages such as Ps. Philo 32:15, which claims that the knowledge of God is a strong tower in which the Israelite may find protection, would neatly fall into this category according to Olyan.

Olyan's second category is termed divinization. In this grouping Olyan proposes to include those objects or attributes which have received cultic devotion in some manner. Olyan has noted in defense of this grouping that it was rather commonplace in the Ancient Near East for divine attributes to obtain to this status. And it is precisely this criterion of receiving cultic veneration that Olyan relies upon to distinguish a hypostasis from those cases which receive special figurative treatment. In this area, Olyan can point to several positive examples of this phenomenon, such the cultic veneration of the name of Baal; thus, in Olyan's framework the name of Baal was divinized, that is, it can be called a hypostasis.

Olyan has served the scholarly world well insofar as his use of comparative Old Testament and rabbinic materials has demonstrated that many divine attributes-which some scholars have on occasion accepted as hypostatic agents (e.g. *Panîm*; Arm of the Lord; Wisdom;

¹⁰⁵⁹Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 88-98.

¹⁰⁶⁰*Ibid.*, 91.

Memra; *Kāvôd*; *Dābār*, *Shem*)-were simply accorded metaphorical treatment in many Old Testament passages.¹⁰⁶¹ Indeed, Olyan's work has exposed the fact that many previous workers in this area have not proceeded with sufficient caution.¹⁰⁶²

While it must be acknowledged that Olyan has provided a useful clarification his proposed definitions fall short for the purposes of my study, for his study focused upon materials from the Ancient Near East during a much earlier period than the era of my concern, and consequently, he did not entertain Greco-Roman perceptions. Thus, while I intend to retain Olyan's twofold classification I must also augment it so as to embrace the Greco-Roman evidence.

In light of the Greco-Roman evidence, I contend that we need to go beyond Olyan's two-tiered schema. As we have seen, there are cases where certain entities of Greco-Roman magic (e.g., names of deities and the so-called *πάρεδροι*, i.e. essentially demons who assisted the magicians)¹⁰⁶³ clearly go beyond even special figurative treatment, and yet they do not receive cultic devotion. Moreover, in certain cases it is evident that these entities were thought of as being genuinely 'real' independent entities apart from the gods themselves. If we do not recognize these entities for what they are and instead adhere strictly to Olyan's schema we deny ourselves the opportunity to learn something new about magical thought in the Greco-Roman world. With specific respect to numinous names how then might we discriminate a 'true'

¹⁰⁶¹Ibid.: 92-98. Pace Pfeifer who maintains that such figurative treatment of divine properties or attributes was foreign to the Ancients. Accordingly he accepts that the Name in the Old Testament was a hypostasis (see *Ursprung*: 15, 71-72). Along the lines which Olyan has sketched one might also note the observation by Cohen that passages such as Isa. 30:27, where it states that "the Name comes" clearly refers to God himself, while the parallel passage in 59:19 alternates between the Name and glory without distinction. Cohen is joined by König who also agrees with this analysis. See Samuel S. Cohon, "The Name of God, A Study of Rabbinic Theology," *Hebrew Union College Annual Part I*, 23 (1950-51): 579-604 and Eduard König, *Theologie des Alten Testaments: kritisch und vergleichend dargestellt*, 4th ed (Stuttgart: Chr. Belser, 1923), 132.

¹⁰⁶²Pace Giesebrecht (among others) who sees in these metaphors a real hypostasis which finds ready parallels in various Ancient Near Eastern examples. See for example *ATSNG*, 102-105, 116-118. The sole exception here is Jacob, who rightly recognized that the hypostasis conception of the Name did not hold true for the Old Testament. See Benno Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes*, 47 and *passim*.

¹⁰⁶³Ciraolo notes that the *πάρεδροι* are not only considered to be divine but are often called by the name of a well-known deity to whom they were apparently affiliated in some way. See Leda Jean Ciralo, "Supernatural Assistants in the Greek Magical Papyri," in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, ed. M. Meyer & P. Mirecki (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 280.

hypostasis¹⁰⁶⁴ from a divine name that received special figurative treatment? To answer this I have drawn upon the insights yielded by T. Hopfner's work.

Hopfner's suggestion, as we may recall, advances along two lines and has paved a new path to understanding this phenomenon. First, Hopfner proposes that when we encounter a supplicant in our sources who invokes a divine name itself; that is, they seem to invoke the name without addressing the divinity to appear and do their bidding, then we are dealing with a hypostatic-like conception of the divine name.¹⁰⁶⁵ In addition, Hopfner notes that on occasion numinous names could themselves be commanded to carry out a task as if they were autonomous from the deity which they ostensibly represent.

The second criterion that Hopfner suggests involves those cases where the names of the gods seem to have been envisioned as dwelling in a specific geographic area such as the heavens. If Hopfner has read the evidence correctly, and I believe he has, then at least some Greco-Roman practitioners of magic viewed these names as being in some sense ontologically real. And their ability to operate and exist independently of the deity suggests that they were also in some manner autonomous from the deity.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Although I acknowledge Olyan's classification, in particular his criterion for recognizing a divinized entity, I shall nonetheless retain the term hypostasis for the sake of simplicity. After all, it is Olyan's criterion of cultic veneration that is significant, not per se his proposed terms.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Theodor Hopfner, *GAOZ*, § 693.

APPENDIX FOUR

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CULTIC ACTIONS

The significance of religious practices within religion as a whole has been summarized well by Mowinckel who stated that “Alle wichtigen Phänomene der Religion irgendwie in naher Verbindung mit dem Kultus stehen.”¹⁰⁶⁶ From this insight it may be deduced that religious practice influences cultus and cultus in turn becomes the most important setting where the introduction and institutionalization of ritual practices takes place. Mowinckel also offers a useful definition of cultic acts. He states that:

The cult is thus a general phenomenon appearing in all religions...cult or ritual may be defined as the socially established and regulated holy acts and words in which the encounter and communion of the deity with the congregation is established, developed, and brought to its ultimate goal. In other words: a relation in which a religion becomes a vitalizing function as a communion of God and congregation, and of the members of the congregation amongst themselves.¹⁰⁶⁷

This definition allows us to see that ritualistic actions and practices can serve as the most basic criterion for defining the boundaries of a religious group and provides the essential cohesion that allows for a group dynamic to occur. Moreover, these practices enshrine the beliefs of a group. Ritual practices such as worship, confessions, and other aspects of group behavior provide the mortar and brick for erecting the ideological walls that define a community. As such these practices provide a secure insight into the beliefs of the group being investigated.

It will be helpful if I also take the time here to introduce the additional definitions that Karsten Lehmkuhler has put forth. Lehmkuhler proposes the following definitions:

1) The proper way to judge and evaluate religiosity is by the external form adopted by the adherents.¹⁰⁶⁸ Among these external forms cultus is the most important. It is the visible and auditory side of religion.

2) Religion can be divided into three categories; holy words, a sanctified people, and holy traditions and customs. Both magic and cultus fall into the latter category.¹⁰⁶⁹

¹⁰⁶⁶ Sigmund Mowinckel, *Religion und Kultus*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), 9.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship. V.I*, trans. D. R. Ap-Thompson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), 15.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Lehmkuhler, *Kultus und Theologie*, 35.

¹⁰⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 39.

3) For Lehmkuöler cultus is “that attempt to act upon a personal spirit or god through a personal relationship.”¹⁰⁷⁰ This aspect can be most clearly seen through worship and adoration so that one can say that without cultus there is no fellowship with the divine.¹⁰⁷¹

4) Cultic activity can be classified as that side of religion that is reflective of popular conception and practice.¹⁰⁷²

If we step back for a moment and look at Biblical Judaism we find that the role of cultic activities can hardly be overstated as it formed the setting where the Israelite encountered YHWH.¹⁰⁷³ It was simply “ein Kraftzentrum, von dem geistige Kräfte ausgehen.”¹⁰⁷⁴ In terms of the cultic importance of divine names Heitmüller correctly maintained that the name was the most basic elementary and important component of cultic activity. The main key in securing the presence of the divinity is the ability to communicate with the deity in a medium through which one could call on it to appear, carry out instructions, or alternatively answer prayer.¹⁰⁷⁵

¹⁰⁷⁰ Ibid. My translation.

¹⁰⁷¹ Ibid., 40.

¹⁰⁷² Ibid., 168.

¹⁰⁷³ John L. McKenzie, “Cult”, in *The Flowering of Old Testament: A Reader in Twentieth-Century Old Testament Theology, 1930-1990*, Sources for Biblical and Theological Study, Old Testament Series 1, eds. Ben C. Ollenburger, Elmer A. Martens and Gerhard F. Hasel (Winona Lake Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 175.

¹⁰⁷⁴ So Gillis Wetters. See Gillis Wetters, *Altchristliche Liturgien II: Das christliche Opfer neue Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahls*, (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922), 181.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Wilhelm Heitmüller, “Namenglaube im Neuen Testament,” 661.

APPENDIX FIVE

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

Any inquiry into the place and function of the name-concept within Near Eastern cultures must first take up the question of magic and cultic invocation, for there are no other areas in which the application of divine names is so vital to the success of the endeavor as it is here. When we turn to seek the roots of Jewish magic and name-mysticism we do not have far to look. Ostensibly, the putative progenitors of the Jewish name-conception were primarily Egyptian and Babylonian magic and religion.¹⁰⁷⁶ I need not detain myself here by an exhaustive review of Egyptian magical practices, but several examples culled from early Egyptian sources will demonstrate that a magical aura already enshrouded divine names in pre-Hellenistic Egyptian culture. I shall now turn to examining some of the evidence that we have available to us.

An excellent place to begin this brief review is with a look at a text which dates from the reign of Pepi II, where we find the following invocation of the gods, "Great company of the gods who dwell in Annu, grant that Pepi Nefer-ka-Râ may flourish,...even as the name of Temu, the chief of the nine gods, does flourish."¹⁰⁷⁷ Here we can see that the notion of a person, or object, and its name, as being tightly interwoven was well received.

Another text worth mentioning is the Papyrus of Nesi-Amsu, where following the outline of the legend of the creation of the cosmos it is recorded that the god Neb-er-tcher existed before the hylic realm was fashioned. At the moment when the god is in the midst of the act of self-creation and is coming into being he states:

I created [from] my mouth, and I uttered my own name as a word of power and I thus evolved myself under the evolutions of the god Khepera, and I developed myself out of the primeval matter...¹⁰⁷⁸

¹⁰⁷⁶Jacob may not be far from the mark when he posits that the more magical beliefs concerning divine names stems from Alexandrian Hellenistic-Judaism. It is also important to observe that Arai had pointed out that the Second Book of Jeu, *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, Philo, Clement of Alexandria, and *Pistis Sophia*, all emphasize name-speculation of one sort or another, and that they all stem from Egypt. Add to this Blau's conjecture that the Tetragrammaton passed into currency from its usage at the Temple of Onias in Egypt. See *ING*, 110. See also, Arai Sasagu, *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964), 71; Blau, *DAJZ*, 133; and Heitmüller, *INJ*, 182-190, 218-222.

¹⁰⁷⁷As quoted in Budge. See E.A. Wallis Budge *Egyptian Magic* (New York: University Books, 1899), 158-9.

¹⁰⁷⁸*Ibid.*, 161.

Another particular of some interest is the fact that for some adherents of Egyptian religion the Egyptian gods were viewed as divinized entities of the name of the god Nu. In chapter XVII of the Egyptian Book of the Dead we find the following declaration of this theologoumenon:

I am the great god Nu, ...who made his name to become the company of the gods....What does this mean? It is Râ, the creator of the names of his limbs, which came into being in the form of the gods.

From this text many scholars of Egyptian religion have concluded that the gods were thought of as personifications of the names of Râ.¹⁰⁷⁹

Another central tenet of the Egyptian name-concept was that the gods possessed secret names. This perception led in the course of time to the construct that both those who occupied themselves with carrying out proper cultus, as well as the theurgist, must, above all else, ascertain the 'true' names of the gods in order either to induce them into compliance, or to obtain divine interaction.¹⁰⁸⁰ In a further development that closely mirrors Greco-Roman beliefs we find the concept that it was prohibited to disclose the true name of the gods in the hope that these names would not fall into the hands of potential enemies.¹⁰⁸¹

The most conspicuous example of this conception in Egyptian religion is the well-known account of the search for the secret name of Râ by Isis. In the tale, Râ is bitten by a poisonous serpent and falls gravely ill. Râ summons his retinue to search for anyone who has the magical power to help him. Isis answers this call and seeks to surreptitiously obtain his true name for she believes that by means of his name she can attain divine status. She asks, "Cannot I, by means of the sacred name of God, make myself mistress of the earth and become a goddess like unto Râ in heaven and upon earth?" In an effort to uncover the secret name Isis promises the cessation of his agony if he will reveal to her his secret name for she says, "Your secret name is not among those which you have told me. Confess it to me and the poison will go."¹⁰⁸²

¹⁰⁷⁹Ibid., 162.

¹⁰⁸⁰So Brashear, "The Greek Magical Papyri," 3392.

¹⁰⁸¹Jacob, *ING*, 91.

¹⁰⁸²As quoted in Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, 137-138.

In a strongly analogous myth Horus is said to have been sailing one day with his brother. The brother managed to receive a deadly snakebite and subsequently fell ill. Horus importuned his brother to reveal to him his secret name so that he may pronounce it in a healing incantation. His brother, at first reticent to divulge this privileged name, relents and tells it to Horus, and forthwith, Horus then pronounces the healing spell.¹⁰⁸³

We see this theologoumenon again in an *adoratio* to Horus, which also deals with the healing of a poisonous bite, where the following use of names in healing is found, "...I have spoken your name...May you exorcise for me the pulsating poison....See your name is (involved) therein on this day....See your name is invoked on this day: I am Horus the Savior who insures protection for you."¹⁰⁸⁴

Another example of Egyptian name-mysticism is found in a hymn where the god Shu is said to have an unknown name, which when spoken at the bank of a river would cause the river to dry up. Further, it is said that if this name was spoken upon the earth a flame would issue forth.¹⁰⁸⁵

Within the era of my concern we can find numerous examples of the influence of Egyptian magical practices and conceptions, as well as evidence of how non-Egyptians viewed the magical powers thought to be taught in Egypt. A case in point can be found in the exploits of Harnuphis, the priestly magician, who it is claimed, rescued the Roman troops under Marcus Aurelius by bringing down rain in the Danube campaign undertaken in 172 C.E.¹⁰⁸⁶

As for the gods themselves an interesting example of the perceived apotropaic nature of the names of the Egyptian gods is probably alluded to in *Joseph and Aseneth* 3:11, where, no doubt in reflection of current Egyptian practices, we read of Aseneth's preparation to meet her parents, who have come in from the fields to make preparations to receive Joseph. We read that Aseneth had "girded herself (with) a golden girdle and put bracelets on her hands and feet...and

¹⁰⁸³As related in C. Jacq, *Egyptian Magic* (Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1985), 49-50.

¹⁰⁸⁴In J.F. Bourghouts, *Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978), 83-84.

¹⁰⁸⁵*Ibid.*, 87-88.

¹⁰⁸⁶Dio Cassius 71.8.4.

the names of the gods of Egyptians were engraved everywhere on the bracelets and the stones...” Here the implication is that these bracelets were a type of amulet thought to ward off evil.

We can also see how widely Egyptian magical practices had spread when later in the Late Antique period the Talmudic Rabbis opined “Ten measures of witchcraft have come into the world. Egypt received nine of these, the rest of the world one measure.”¹⁰⁸⁷

Suffice it to say that sufficient evidence exists such that scholars of Egyptian religion are united in their conviction that names of power were an indispensable element of magical practice.¹⁰⁸⁸

Switching to the religious and cultic aspects of the application of divine names several interesting features surface in examination of various Egyptian sources. Worthy of mention is an inscription from the era of Ramses IV (1200 B.C.E.). It states that if one speaks the name of Ptah-Tatenen then this act was accounted to that person as a sin.¹⁰⁸⁹ In another interesting case, Cicero reports that the Egyptians of his day were prohibited from vocalizing the name of Thoth.¹⁰⁹⁰ Furthermore, in concert with the foregoing, we find the prohibition against falsely swearing an oath in the name of Ptah.¹⁰⁹¹ In addition, it was claimed that at the very name of Seth the earth and the heavenlies, as well as the underworld, would shake.¹⁰⁹²

Another vital role which divine names played in Egypt was the belief that through invoking them one could insure the presence of the god. By way of example, on a stele from the New Kingdom Era we find written the following, “The august god (Râ), beloved and gracious,

¹⁰⁸⁷ In b.Qid 49b.

¹⁰⁸⁸ To cite but two, Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, 61 ff. and Geraldine Pinch, *Magic in Ancient Egypt*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994), 87-88, 163.

¹⁰⁸⁹ As cited in Kákosy, *Zauberei im alten Ägypten*, 117.

¹⁰⁹⁰ In Bourghouts, *Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts*, 118.

¹⁰⁹¹ Ibid., 102. See also pg. 238. The text is from a stele in the British Museum, *Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae*. 9 vol. (London. 1911-70). Bourghouts cites from v. 9, plate 31 no. 589.

¹⁰⁹² Ibid., 87-88.

who answers prayers, who listens to the suppliant of him who calls him, who comes at the voice of him who pronounces his name."¹⁰⁹³

Similarly, a prayer to Thoth describes Thoth as one who is "...listening to the prayers of [the] one who calls upon him, And who comes at the voice of the one who pronounces his name..."¹⁰⁹⁴ And in a prayer to Amenophis I we find that "one comes to you [through] the greatness of your name, when is heard your strong name."¹⁰⁹⁵

The tendency to direct encomium toward the name of the divinity, a practice so familiar to the Old Testament scholar, is also attested to in numerous texts. To cite but one example, the name of Amun is praised in the following fashion, "...sweeter, sweeter is the great name of Amun, more than [precious things]."¹⁰⁹⁶

Moving into the Fertile Crescent we again encounter the name-concept in ways similar to that which we have encountered in Egyptian sources. For example, in one particular Ugaritic text (ca. fourteenth century), which mirrors what we have seen concerning the gods being seen as personifications of divine names, we find Ashtoreth described as "the name of Baal." In an Eshmuna inscription Astarte also shares the prize of being called "the name of Baal."¹⁰⁹⁷ And in a striking parallel to contemporaneous Jewish sources the name of Baal is said to come on the day of battle (cf. Isa. 30:27).¹⁰⁹⁸ Indeed, this sort of particularizing manifestation of a deity

¹⁰⁹³ As cited in Sadek Iskander Ashraf, *Popular Religion in Egypt during the New Kingdom* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1987), 96. Taken from M. Tosi and A. Roccati, *Stele e ALTRE Epigrafi di DEIR el Medina*. (Torino, 1972), 50042, 3-5.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Ibid., 208. Taken from fasc. II, 79-81, fig. 159, plate XI, no. 111:2-3 in B. Bruyère, *Rapport sur les Fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1922-23) to (1948-51) 18 parts in 20*. Cairo, 1924-1953.

¹⁰⁹⁵ Ibid., 207. From, *Stele e Altre*: 049:B:5.

¹⁰⁹⁶ Ibid., 204. The author cites from J. Černý and Sir A.H. Gardiner, *Hieratic Ostraca I*. (Oxford: 1957), 45.4.

¹⁰⁹⁷ See W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* V. 2 (London: SCM Press, 1961-7), 44. Both examples are also in Carl Judson Davies, *The Name and Way of the Lord* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 112. The latter example is also found in Heitmüller, *INJ*, 154.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Cited in R. S. Hess, "Yahweh and His Asherah? Epigraphic Evidence for Religious Pluralism in Old Testament Times," in *One God, One Lord in a World of Religious Pluralism*, eds. A.D. Clarke and B.W. Winter, (Cambridge: Tyndale House, 1991), 22. This citation can also be found in Davies, *The Name and Way of the Lord*, 112.

(*sensu stricto* Olyan) was almost customary in the Ancient Near East.¹⁰⁹⁹ Insofar as Ashtoreth is in fact the name of Baal, and insofar as she later receives full cultic devotion, it may be said that the name of Baal had evolved so far as to attain divinization.¹¹⁰⁰

As for the utilization of the names of the gods as apotropaic agents, we have evidence of such usage, in Mesopotamia at least, by no later than the sixth century B.C.E. For example, in an exorcistic text we read, "In the name of the great god Ea....be thou exorcised!"¹¹⁰¹ Given this preoccupation with powerful names in Babylonian religion, perhaps there is a kernel of truth in the assertion of the Palestinian Talmud when it declares, "The names of the Angels came along with those who returned from Babylon."¹¹⁰²

¹⁰⁹⁹Ibid., 97.

¹¹⁰⁰Ibid., 107.

¹¹⁰¹As quoted in Edwin Yamauchi, "Magic or Miracle? Diseases, Demons and Exorcisms," in *Gospel Perspectives: The Miracles of Jesus*, V. 6, eds. David Wenham and Craig Bloomberg, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 101. For further examples of invocations where names of power are employed in Babylonian magic see Otto Weber, *Dämonenbeschwörung bei den Babyloniern und Assyriern: Eine Skizze* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), 33-35.

¹¹⁰²RoshHaShana 56d.

APPENDIX SIX

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN RABBINIC SOURCES

The name-conception poured into the rabbinical stream of thought in both the Talmudic and Targumic literature. The growing emphasis and mysticism which was forming around the Name is seen in the seemingly ubiquitous reference to the Name as **שם המפרש**; that is, the separate special name of God. This phrase encapsulates well the notion that the true name of God was powerful.¹¹⁰³ Strangely this turn of events had reversed the significance of the disclosure of the divine name in Exodus. Apparently the rabbis must have felt compelled to keep the name of God secret for precisely the same reasons that the names of the gods of the pagans were guarded.¹¹⁰⁴

Other evidence also suggests a growing evolution in the name-concept in rabbinic circles. This development can be seen in a number of texts. For example, according to R. Jose b. Chalaftha (*Mekilta Ex. 20:3*) the gods of the pagans were powerless because they did not bear the name of God, while Targ. Jonath. Ex. 28:30 states that whosoever shall pronounce the Name in an emergency will be saved.

Other narratives such as *b. Tamid*. 3.8 claim that when the Name is spoken in Jerusalem it could be heard as far away as Jericho, and when the Name was spoken during Yom Kippur, it is said, all the people congregated there fell upon their faces and blessed the Name (*Yoma* 6.2).

In *b. Sabb.* 120a we find a gemara, which deals with a mishna that takes up the theme of how one ought to put out fires (i.e. what materials are kosher to handle and treat). The tractate states that if a person has the divine Name inscribed upon his flesh in the public domain, where the Name could be witnessed, the person was to cover the Name by winding a leaf of reed around it. Interestingly, this gemara also discusses the rabbinical injunction which forbade standing nude before the Name. As in our previous case, the Name was to be covered while bathing.¹¹⁰⁵

¹¹⁰³So Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 268.

¹¹⁰⁴Ibid.

¹¹⁰⁵In the following expose I am indebted to the sketches outlined by Blau in his chapter „Die mystischen Gottesnamen“ in *DAJZW*, 117-128, 146, as well as Ephraim Urbach's chapter, "The Power of the Divine Name," in his *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, 2nd ed., trans. Israel Abrahams, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979), 124-134.

In addition, in the rabbis' schema heaven and earth shall pass away, but the Name will endure. While in the present age only certain individuals have the divine Name revealed to them, in the world to come, all will know His Name. Not only must the name of God not be effaced, but also neither can even one letter be tampered with or erased. And in an amusing legend it is said that Moses would only speak the Tetragrammaton after he had spoken at least 212 other words, for the Name ostensibly should not be spoken too often.

In Talmud (*b. Sukkah*. 53a), there is a tradition about David digging a pit whereupon it was reputed that David had broken open the fountains of the Great Deep. In order to seal off the fissure David utilized the numinous power of the Tetragrammaton as the narrative states:

When David dug the pits, the Deep arose and threatened to submerge the world...thereupon [David] inscribed the [Ineffable] Name upon a shard, cast it into the deep and it subsided sixteen thousand cubits.

Other Talmudic gemara also impute numinous qualities to the Name. One maintains that while Joseph was in Egypt he was made to learn seventy languages,¹¹⁰⁶ but he was unable to do so. In the night the angel Gabriel is said to have come to him and added to his name a letter from the Tetragrammaton [i.e. *yod*] and with that Joseph was immediately able to learn all seventy languages!

Other Talmudic texts also claim that the divine name had numinous qualities. In *b. San.* 95a the narrative recounts the apocryphal tale of David's flight from Ishbi-benob. Earlier in the legend David's compatriot, Abishai, had killed Ishbi-benob's mother. In response Ishbi-benob, thinking that he now faced both men alone, decided that it would be prudent to fall upon one of them and quickly kill him and equal out the odds. Thereupon, Ishbi-benob came upon David and threw him in the air and placed his spear under David's supposed path of descent with the intention that the resultant thrusting would kill him. Abishai, in an attempt to interdict this calamity, pronounced the divine name, and concomitantly, David was suspended in midair! Then, in order to secure David's safe descent he invoked the divine name again, and forthwith, David descended gently to the ground.

In *Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael*, in what may be a remnant of an older tradition, we read the amusing story of how Moses successfully raised the coffin of Joseph from the waters of Nile

¹¹⁰⁶ A rabbinic, and even pre-rabbinic, notion which held that the original number of national groups instituted by God was seventy in number.

by inscribing the divine Name upon a tablet and throwing it into the river, while in *b. Bava Batra* 73a we read that seafarers were protected from inclement weather and rough seas by striking the water with clubs which had the divine Name inscribed upon them. In addition, we also read that every angel has a tablet over his heart which has the name of God combined with the name of the angel.

Other texts, such as *b. Sanh.* 106a, relate that at least some rabbis evidently believed that Jesus raised himself from the dead by invoking the true name of God, “Woe to him who makes himself alive by the name of God.” Irrespective of whether this baraita actually refers to Jesus (as seems likely) it clearly demonstrates the imputation of numinous qualities to the Tetragrammaton. In addition, some rabbis seem to have believed that Moses was able to accomplish his miracles because the divine name had been embossed upon his staff.¹¹⁰⁷

The name-concept is also well represented within the Targumim. For example, in *Targum Yerushalmi I (Pseudo-Jonathan)* Ex. 32:25, the meturgeman issues a midrash that is intended to serve as an aetiology of how the infamous golden calf of the rebellious Israelites came into existence. In this Targum we read that on account of Aaron’s infidelity the Israelites were seduced and consequently stripped off the golden crowns that they had been wearing on which the divine Name had been “clearly” inscribed. Thereafter, they threw them into the fire that produced the golden calf. In this Targum it is claimed that Satan entered into the gold in order to effect the supernatural transformation of the golden crowns into the calf.

But in *Targum Neofiti I* (ca. second century C.E.),¹¹⁰⁸ where the same account is narrated, we find one important element missing—there is no mention of Satan enabling the gold to be transformed from one image into another. What is left unsaid is what agency might be responsible for effecting the change. It may be that the meturgeman for *Neofiti I* might have understood that the golden crowns with the divine Name were transformed due of the power resident within the Name itself. However, this conception possibly stumbles upon the notion that an ostensibly observant Jew would scarcely impute such malevolent characteristics to the divine

¹¹⁰⁷Simon, *Verus Israel*, 344.

¹¹⁰⁸Many scholars subscribe to this early date. For a full bibliography see, Evans, *Noncanonical Writings*, 101.

Name. The potentially offensive contention that the divine Name could produce the golden calf may be at the root of the absence of this tradition in *Targum Yerushalmi* I.

As for literary Jewish texts, we find that the stamp of name-magic upon the Talmud is also fairly strong. In *b. Sabb.* 61b we find a gemara on the use of amulets states that some amulets, utensils, and even the legs of beds, had the divine name inscribed upon them, presumably to ward off evil. In *m. Shabbat* vi.2 we read of the halakha that one should not go out on the Sabbath with an amulet, and of another prohibition not to make amulets on the Sabbath (*m. Shabbat* viii.2-3). Evidently, our sources suggest that the use of the Name in amulets was, in general, a fairly widely practiced form of apotropaism. Even the names of the demons themselves could protect one when engraved upon an amulet-at least according to Talmudic Rabbis!¹¹⁰⁹ For still other examples from the rabbinic literature I direct the reader to Heitmüller.¹¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰⁹ *T. Baba batra* 134a.

¹¹¹⁰ Heitmüller, *INJ*, 141-145.

APPENDIX SEVEN

OTHER CONJECTURES ON THE ORIGIN OF THE *NOMINA SACRA*

That Jesus' name might have been numerologically interpreted beyond just the example given in the Epistle of Barnabas, mentioned earlier, is of some interest. No doubt this use of gematria did not end with the play on the number 18. One example of its continued use is found in *Oracula Sibyllina* 1.325, where the Sibyl's oracular musings produce the claim:

Then indeed the son of the great God will come, incarnate, likened to mortal men on earth, bearing four vowels, and the consonants in him are two. I will state explicitly the entire number for you. For eight units, and equal number of tens in addition to these, and eight hundreds [i.e., IHΣOYΣ is 10+8+200+70+400+200 which comes to 888] will reveal his name to men who are staid [sober or serious] with faithfulness.¹¹¹¹

Along similar lines it can be seen that Jesus' name was pregnant with consequence as a Greek *Zahlenwort*, for many groups speculated in this manner (including heterodox groups), as Irenaeus indicates concerning the doctrines of the followers of Marcus:

This which you know and seem to possess, is not an ancient name...For Jesus is a name arithmetically, symbolical, consisting of six letters, and is known to all that belong to the called....This is the name of Jesus; for this name, if you count up the numerical value of the letters, amounts to eight hundred and eighty-eight. Thus, then you have a clear statement of their opinion as to the origin of the supercelestial Jesus. Wherefore, also, the alphabet of the Greek contains eight Monads, eight Decads, and eight Hecatads, which present the number eight hundred and eighty eight, that is *Jesus*, who is formed of all numbers; *and on this account he is called Alpha and Omega, indicating his origin from all* [emphasis mine].¹¹¹²

What we should grasp here is both the symbolic use of Alpha-Omega, as well as the number symbolism of 888.

Of further interest is Marcus' opinion, which was that it was for symbolical and mystical reasons that God sent the Name (i.e. the six letter name of Jesus). Marcus states:

But when the Name of six letters was manifested the person bearing it clothing himself in flesh, that he might come under the comprehension of man's senses, and having in himself these six and twenty-four letters [i.e. the total number of the Greek alphabet],

¹¹¹¹ In a variant of this 137-145 says, "I am the one who is, but you consider in your heart: I am robed in heaven, draped around with sea, the earth is the support of my feet, around my body is poured the air, the entire chorus of stars revolve around me. I have nine letters, I am of four syllables. Consider me: The first three have two letters each. The last has the rest, and five are consonants. The entire number is: twice eight plus three hundred, three tens and seven."

¹¹¹² In *ad Haer.*, I. XIV, 4; XV, 2. The group which Irenaeus inveighs against here believed that they traveled through seven heavens in order to arrive at the eighth, the ogdoad-the goal of those who possess the perfect gnosis.

then becoming acquainted with him they ceased from ignorance and passed from death into life, this *Name* [emphasis mine] serving as their guide to the Father...¹¹¹³

Marcus amplifies this credo when he also states that Jesus is the Alpha and Omega because the numerical value of Alpha and Omega is 801, while the value for 'the Savior' is also 801.¹¹¹⁴ Moreover, the value for the dove, the quintessential emblem of the savior, also has as its numerical valuation 801. Thus, following Greek numerological convention we see that "Jesus" was interlaced with the Alpha and Omega symbolism in two different ways.

Marcus further distinguishes himself by adding yet another new twist, viz., the bizarre number symbolism reported in Hippolytus' *Haer.* VI.41 (cf. Irenaeus I. XV). Marcus postulated with respect to Jesus that:

Jesus possesses this ineffable generation. For from the mother of the universe, I mean the first tetrad, proceeded forth, in the manner of a daughter, the second tetrad. And it became an ogdoad, from which proceeded forth the decade; and thus was produced ten, and next eighteen. The decade, therefore, coming in along with the ogdoad, and rendering it tenfold, produced the number eighty; and again making eighty tenfold, generated the number eight hundred. And so it is that the entire number of letters that proceeded forth from ogdoad into decade is eight hundred and eighty-eight, which is Jesus; for the name Jesus, according to the number in letters, is eight hundred and eighty-eight. Now likewise the Greek alphabet has eight monads and eight decades, and eight hecatontads; and these exhibit the calculated sum of eight hundred and eighty-eight, that is, Jesus, who consists of all numbers. And that on this account He is called Alpha (and Omega)...¹¹¹⁵

As this quote shows, Marcus' view of the name of Jesus runs along the same lines as the Book of Revelation when it claims that Jesus is the Alpha and the Omega. Both Marcus, and Revelation, used letter symbolism to signify the infinite and eternal nature of the name of Jesus.¹¹¹⁶

This mystical ΑΩ-*Zahlenwert* is in part derived from the fact that the cosmos was viewed as being comprised of twenty-four elements;¹¹¹⁷ incidentally the exact same number as the letters

¹¹¹³ In *ad Haer.* I. XV, 2. Irenaeus, for one, is unimpressed with Marcus' explanation of things and roundly criticizes his excessive speculations. This is made quite clear in I. XV, 5.

¹¹¹⁴ Ibid. I. XIV, 6; XV, 1. Another example of numerical equivalence allowing for the conflation of two divine beings is found in later Jewish lore. Metatron, as it turns out, equals 314, the same number as Shaddai. This allowed for some to speculate that Metatron was the demiurge. For more see Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic*, 262.

¹¹¹⁵ It is interesting to note that in later Jewish Hekhaloth literature the name of the *Ogdoads* is called, 'Azbogah (אֲזִבְגָּה). This name is composed of two groups of three consonants and each group numerically adds up to the number eight. Together this yields the number 888. For further details see Gershom G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960), 66.

¹¹¹⁶ Along similar lines see Clement, *Stromata*, VI. XVI

in the Greek alphabet. Accordingly, as Miller expresses it, the Greek alphabet is “cosmic” and “forms an exact ‘double’ of the heavenly elements.”¹¹¹⁸ In accordance with this principle then the symbolic $\Lambda\Omega$ must represent not only the beginning and end, but also encapsulation of the entire cosmos.¹¹¹⁹ Thus, the Alpha-Omega is a sort of contraction, symbolizing the all-powerful nature of God. Hull has put it well when he summarizes the symbolic importance of the Alpha-Omega imagery:

There are twenty-four hours in the day and twenty-four letters in the Greek alphabet. Every letter equals an hour and is therefore an image of divinity. The alpha-omega, like the sum of the hours, represents the power of God in his totality.¹¹²⁰

Perhaps the notion of Alpha-Omega as a contraction which symbolized divine reality found its way into Christian circles and helped form the basis for the creation of the *nomina sacra*. However, we can infer little of real, hard, evidentiary value about the origin of the *nomina sacra* and some connection with Alpha-Omega conceptions.

For example, we do not know whether the association attested here was already operational in the first century, or if it had any influence in the formative stages of the development of the *nomina sacra*. It could just as easily have been a witness to a subsequent development in the unfolding evolution of the sacerdotal nature of the *nomina sacra*. Having sided with the minimalist position, it nonetheless appears that Roberts’ assessment was striking in its prescience when he made these illuminating remarks:

It seems then that there were two lines of development, the one owing to number symbolism, the other, perhaps with an allusion to Alpha Omega, taking the first and last

¹¹¹⁷ See *PGM XXXIX*. 20.

¹¹¹⁸ Patricia Cox Miller, “In Praise of Nonsense,” in *Classical Mediterranean spirituality: Egyptian, Greek, Roman*, ed. A.H. Armstrong, (New York : Crossroad, 1986), 496.

¹¹¹⁹ This raises the possibility that the notion of ‘Alpha-Omega’ or alternatively, ‘the beginning and the end,’ may have had some religious connotation quite apart from the ambit of Judeo-Christian thought. In an interesting third century hymn to Tyche (i.e. the goddess Chance) the devotee extols her variegated virtues, but then concludes with this statement, “For you hold the beginning and the end of all things!” This type of language is of course the language of lordship so perhaps similar claims came to be applied to Jesus. For the reference to Tyche see John U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925), 196.

¹¹²⁰ Hull, *Hellenistic Magic*, 42. An almost verbatim representation of the sentiments of Philo. See *Quaer. et Sol.Gen.*, 2.5.

letters. If, as looks probable enough, Ἰησοῦς was the first name to be treated as a *nomen sacrum*, the abbreviation KC for κύριος would have been formed by analogy.¹¹²¹

Another possibility for the origin of the *nomina sacra* is derived from the fact that letters were considered significant in and of themselves. This was due in part to the notion that the letters of the name were of paramount importance in magic, and this played into the hands of those who sought a deeper meaning from onomatomantic procedures, as Hopfner notes:

Nun bestehen aber gerade die „echtesten“ Götternamen gewöhnlich aus sehr vielen Lauten, bzw. Buchstaben und konnten, gerade weil sie für die Griechen oder auch sogar für Menschen überhaupt unverständlich (ἄσχημα) waren....Dem suchte man dadurch abzuhelpfen, daß man hinter besonders schwierigen oder wichtigen Götternamen die Zahl ihrer Buchstaben angab.¹¹²²

Hopfner's assessment is clearly on the mark, but letters could be seen to be significant even without number symbolism. For example, Pliny the Elder records that the *princeps civitatis* of Rome, one Marcus Servilius Nonianus, employed a charm which contained only the letters *rho* and *alpha* in order to cure an eye affliction.¹¹²³ Moreover, according to Pliny it was widely believed that Pythagoras had demonstrated that names with an uneven number of vowels would invite unfortunate circumstances.¹¹²⁴ We read further that Demetrius' treatise on numbers had shown that the number four was believed to be the prerogative of Hercules.¹¹²⁵ No less taken with number speculation were Pythagoras' followers, or so Varro reports, who states that odd numbers are to be used for healing while the principal virtue of the even numbers is that they are infinite in duration.¹¹²⁶

Also, in a statement in *Metamorphoses* 3.17, Apuleius speaks of metal tablets which were engraved with mysterious letters, while in Plotinus' exposé on magic¹¹²⁷ we encounter a

¹¹²¹ Roberts, *Manuscripts*, 37.

¹¹²² Hopfner, "Mageia," 342.

¹¹²³ HN 28.5. 29.

¹¹²⁴ HN 28.5. 33.

¹¹²⁵ HN 28.17. 64.

¹¹²⁶ As quoted in Virgil's *Aeneid*, 5. 77.

¹¹²⁷ *Enneades*, 4.4.40.

statement that magicians use “figures with power in them,” which when properly deployed, “draw down upon themselves the powers.”

Such conceptions are also found in *Sefer Ha-Razim* where the author contends that even the letters of the Name have numinous power. This is expressed in the last invocation found in the text which deals with the sixth firmament. At 35-45 we read:

I adjure you, O angels of strength and might,...by His name and by its letters; I repeat [your names] and adjure you that you come and stand with me...

The Christian Isaac of Antioch in his polemic against magic further elaborates upon this emphasis upon mystical *Buchstaben*.¹¹²⁸ Isaac points out the significance of *Buchstaben* mysticism:

Whoever writes a *yod* [the initial consonant of the divine name] with his own blood puts himself in the place of the notorious magicians Jannes and Mambres.¹¹²⁹

Another example of letter symbolism is found in *Midrash Rabba* (39.11) where we read:

And I [God] will make your name great [Abram; following Gen. 12:2]. This means: ‘I will add the letter *He* to your name.’ R. Abbahu commented on this: ‘It is not written: Look now **השמים**, but: Look now **השמימה** [Gen. 15:5]. [for God said] ‘With this *He*, I made the world. And behold, I will add it to your name...’

Indeed, accordingly to rabbinic lore the name of the patriarch Judah originated from the Tetragrammaton.¹¹³⁰ And Joseph, in like manner as Abram, had a letter added to his name-the sacred *Yodh* given to him by YHWH.¹¹³¹ In *b. Sota* 36b we read:

R. Hana b. Biza said in the name of R. Simeon the Pious. ‘Because Joseph sanctified the heavenly Name in private one letter was added to him [*yod*] from the Name of the Holy One, blessed be He, but because Judah sanctified the heavenly Name in public, the whole of his name was called after the Name of the Holy One [i.e. **יה** and **י**], blessed be He.’

The rabbis also posited that God had created the cosmos through *Yod* and *He*:

For with *Yod-He*, YHWH created worlds. (Is. 28:4) These are the two worlds which the Holy One, Blessed be He, created, one with the *He* and one with the *Yod*...¹¹³²

¹¹²⁸ *De magis, incantoribus et divinis, et de fine et consummatione.*

¹¹²⁹ As quoted in Simon, *Verus Israel*, 357.

¹¹³⁰ *b. Sota* 10b; *idem*, 36.b.

¹¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹¹³² *b. Menachot* 29b; *p. Haggiah* 77c. Fossum has pointed out that the letter *He* found its place in creation etiology due to Ps. 33:6. Ps. 33:6, which implies that the work of creation requires no more than God’s word (i.e., it was easy). *He*, being an aspirate, a letter requiring little to no effort to pronounce, was then associated with the creation in Rabbinic thought. See Jarl E. Fossum, “In the Beginning was the Name,” 118.

In later kabbalistic speculation the combination *Yod-He* was believed to be characteristic of God's mercy while the alternative name of God (i.e. Elohim) was conceived of as signifying God's judgment.¹¹³³

Moreover, in the magical Eighth Book of Moses (*PGM VIII*) it is strongly intimated that the initials of the names of the gods were a *symbolon* of their numinous names. The text in question reads:

And he [the god] was called [by a name derived] from the nine gods, as having taken away, along with their power, also the initials of their names.¹¹³⁴

Of greater significance is the fact that within the rabbinical ambit, the letters *Aleph* and *Tav*, the first and last letters of the Hebrew alphabet, were emblematic of the *Shekhinah*,¹¹³⁵ while *tav* alone was the sign of salvation.¹¹³⁶ No doubt a similar concept undergirds the passage in Ez. 9:4, whereby YHWH instructs the Temple scribes to write upon the forehead of the righteous the mark (lit., 17, or as it appears in paleo-Hebrew, X) which circumscribes this elect group from those who are to perish. To this registry we may also add the mark of Cain which is perhaps tangentially related to this concept. Another passage which runs along similar lines is Isaiah Is. 44:5, where we read:

This one will say, 'I am the LORD'S';
and that one will call on the name of Jacob;
And another will write *on* his hand, 'Belonging to the LORD,'
And will name Israel's name with honor.

As a parenthetical aside it is of some interest that this type of *χαρακτήρ* (and sealing thereby) is surely to be seen as the background for Rev. 7: 1-4, where it is said that the elect are sealed with the Name upon their foreheads, the Name of *both* the Father and the Son, alerting us that the author and his community thought that Jesus' name was as important as the Tetragrammaton.

¹¹³³ For a succinct review of the kabbalistic speculation upon these two letters as divinely endowed see Stephen G. Wald, *The Doctrine of the Divine Name: An Introduction to classical Kabbalistic Theology*, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 52, 54.

¹¹³⁴ *PGM XIII*, 555

¹¹³⁵ Strack H.L. and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum die Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vol. 3, (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1922-28), 789.

¹¹³⁶ So Simon, *Verus Israel*, 352.

Moreover, we should juxtapose these passages in correct apposition to those very prohibitions in the Old Testament concerning receiving a mark upon the body of anybody—especially those with cultic significance for another god (Lev. 19:28; 21:5; Deut. 14:1). And we should not forget that this notion of religious sealing via letters and symbols stands behind the fact that religious tattooing was rather prevalent in the ancient Greco-Roman world.¹¹³⁷

Thus, these ‘sealings’ must be seen as consecrations which sanctified the votary for cultic activity.¹¹³⁸ Certainly, the Old Testament conception of cultic impurity permeates the prohibitions about receiving marks upon the body. Let us turn our attention back again to the question of the origin of the *nomina sacra*.

If this letter-speculation already occupied itself with not only the names of God but also with His divine mercy then perhaps the contraction of name of Jesus in Hebrew (יהו) would have been seen as exemplifying this concept. The possibilities for this being a legitimate template for the origin of the *nomina sacra* are heightened further in light of the following considerations. First, as Blau points out, the variant יה was often written in place of the full Tetragrammaton and this may have helped fuel the transference from YHWH to the name of Jesus.¹¹³⁹ Secondly, the Greek equivalent, Ια (i.e., Ja), was used (linguistically) in its place among Greek speaking Jews. Other speculation on the import of the letters of the Name abounds, including Jesus’ name.¹¹⁴⁰ Of further possible interest is the notion that in the future world the elect would be able to speak out God’s Name according to its letters, and perhaps Jesus was seen as the fulfillment of this eschatological promise.¹¹⁴¹ Indeed, insofar as Jesus was believed to have inaugurated the new

¹¹³⁷ See Herodotus 2.113; Lucian *Syr. D.* 59; III Macc, 2:29, where it is reported that Ptolemy Philopater branded Jews who were compliant with his programs and put upon them an ivy leaf, the symbol of Dionysian worship.

¹¹³⁸ Concerning this passage Heitmüller speculated over its cultic overtones and states, “Danach muss es noch zu Deuterjesaias Zeiten Kreise gegeben haben, die den Namen Jahve in ihre Hand eingruben,...weil als Kultzeichen der Name der Gottheit selbst erscheint,” *INJ*, 174. Heitmüller also connects this passage with Rev. 13:6; 14:9; 16:2; 19:20 and 20:4.

¹¹³⁹ Blau, *DAJZW*, 123. See also Aune, “Ιαώ,” 1.

¹¹⁴⁰ As one example Schmidt cites the fact that Ἰησοῦς may have seemed to early Greek Christians to be purposeful mimicry of one of Jesus’ major salvific activities (ἰσχυμαί) as Matt. 1:21 indicates. Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 16.

¹¹⁴¹ *b. Pesahim* 50a. Regrettably, it is impossible to know if this notion reaches back into New Testament times.

dispensation then perhaps his name was seen as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton, and, since both it, and its power, were now available God had indeed revealed his full name in this new dispensation through the name of Jesus. With this said we still have another option left, one that has already been hinted at.

Another option is that Jesus' name was a cipher not so much for divine attributes, but for the Tetragrammaton itself. To begin this exposition let us cover some background material. First, we note the import that was given to the name Joshua in Jewish circles, for it contained both vowels of the Tetragrammaton.¹¹⁴² Not without further interest is the comment made by Clement of Alexandria in the *Stromata* (VI. XVII) concerning Jesus' name and *Yod*, "And, in...the Decalogue, by the letter *Iota* [= *Yod*], signifies the blessed Name, presenting Jesus, who is the Word."

Now apparently an analogous situation arose in the rabbinic formulation of the Name as it applied to these two respective consonants. For *Yod*, beyond what we have already had occasion to mention, in the name 'Israel,' was claimed to be intimately bound with the Tetragrammaton because it has *Yod* as its initial consonant.¹¹⁴³ Likewise, the initial syllable of the form אלהם is imputed to be on the heart of every angel for the names of the angels are bound with God's (e.g. Micha-el; Gabri-el, etc).¹¹⁴⁴ Thus, whether *Yod*, *He*, or 'El, any theophoric name which consists of these basic constituents of God's various names could be construed as being bound indissolubly with the name of God, for as Dornseiff notes, "Die Buchstaben des Namens Jahwe יה and י bezeichnen die Seinsgrade der Gottheit."¹¹⁴⁵

Thus, it may be that early Jewish Christians understood the name "Jesus" to be similar to the Tetragrammaton insofar as the former, when suspended, would produce a cipher which would be an identical *nomen sacrum* (i.e. יה) as the Tetragrammaton. Thus, יה, the well-accepted surrogate for יהוה, would also be the contracted form of the Hebrew name of Jesus.

¹¹⁴² Following Blau, who states, "Es ist nämlich anzunehmen, dass in der andeutenden Umschreibung „Jose“ beide Vocale des Tetragramms beibehalten sind, wie in ישראל=אֵיפֹפִי יֵשׁוּעַ, wo EPOPE dieselben Vocale hat, wie ELOHE." Blau points out that this is found as a variant for YHWH in *j. Nedarim* 42c. See Blau, *DAJZW*, 131.

¹¹⁴³ *j. Taan.* 65d.

¹¹⁴⁴ *b. Pes.* 108b.

¹¹⁴⁵ Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet*, 141.

Interestingly, this argument gains currency even if one posits a Greek milieu for this postulated transformation of the ubiquitous Greek name for YHWH (i.e., **Ιαώ**), for this could have also been construed as a *nomen sacrum* for Jesus.¹¹⁴⁶ Perhaps then, the name of Jesus was thought to be a surrogate for the Name and then took on the same outlines of the letter-speculation of the Tetragrammaton.

The final possibility for explicating the origin of the *nomina sacra* revolves around the issue of the meaning of the name of Jesus and is related to our previous option. First, we have two collateral lines of evidence that may allow us to infer that the name of Jesus may have been envisioned as being equatable with the Hebrew word for salvation. Foremost in this connection is the fact that in Hebrew Jesus' name is actually Joshua, and in Hebrew Joshua means, "Yahweh saves." In fact, we can see how this name was appreciated when we note Philo, who in his *De Mut. Nom.* (121-2), relates his view of the name of Joshua (=salvation):

But, moreover, Moses also changes the name of Hosea into that of Joshua; displaying by his new name the distinctive quality of his character; for the name Hosea is interpreted, 'what sort of person is this?' but Joshua means 'the salvation of the Lord' being the name of the most excellent possible character...

The second thread that supports the supposition that the name of Jesus might have been conflated with the notion of salvation is found in Sir 46:1 which states:

Joshua son of Nun was mighty in war, and was the successor of Moses in the prophetic office. He became, as his name implies, a great savior of God's elect, to take vengeance on the enemies that rose against them, so that he might give Israel its inheritance.

We would do well here to remember the concept we encountered earlier where Justin expressly (*Dialogue*, 75) equates Jesus with Joshua and his activities:

Now from the book of Exodus we know that Moses cryptically indicated that the name of God himself...was also Jesus. For it is written: 'And the Lord said to Moses, say to this people: Behold, I send my angel before thy face, to keep thee in thy journey, and bring thee into the place that I have prepared for thee. Take notice of him, and obey his voice; do not disobey him, for he will not pardon thee, because My name is in him.' Consider well who it was that led your fathers into the promised land, namely he who was at first named Auses (Oshea), but later renamed Jesus (Joshua). If you keep this in mind, you

¹¹⁴⁶ Eitrem conjectures on pages 10-11 of his work, *Some Notes on the Demonology of the New Testament*, that the name Jesus is similar to the Greek version of the divine name as found in the heavily Semitic magical formula in PGM IV 3007-3086 (the so-called 'Pibēchēs' exorcism). Here Eitrem notes that **Ιαώ**, and its variant (**ΙΟΥ**), looks suspiciously like the genitive case **ΙΟΥ**. For a thorough examination of the numerous variants of the Tetragrammaton in Greek see Adolf G. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien. Beiträge zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften zur Geschichte der Sprache, des Schrifttums und der Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und des Urchristentums*, (Marburg: N.G. Elwert'sche, 1895), 1-20.

will also realize that the name of him who said to Moses, 'My Name is in him,' was Jesus.

Another fascinating narrative in line with this type of speculation is found in Justin's *Dialogue* 113. Justin chides his Jewish opponents for entangling themselves in incessant speculation over the numerous name changes which are found in the Old Testament (e.g. Abram changed to Abraham), and yet they somehow never seem to come to grips with the significance of the name change to Joshua. For, as Justin states in *Dialogue* 113:

But why do you not similarly investigate the reason why the name of Oshea the son of Nave (Nun), which his father gave him, was changed to Jesus (Joshua)? But since not only was his name altered, but he was also appointed successor to Moses, being the only one of his contemporaries who came out from Egypt, he led the surviving people into the Holy Land...

The power believed to be resident in the name of Jesus is elaborated upon further by Justin, who falls back again upon the Joshua typology in 132, where he states in a comparison of "Oshea" in I Sam. to Joshua when the livestock automatically followed the people of Israel into the Promised Land they did so, "guided by the name of power."

It is completely clear that the early Church viewed Jesus as a sort of Joshua-*redivivus* figure and subsequently, it became possible to make the leap from Jesus' name to 'Jesus as the embodiment of salvation.' This connection between Jesus the Savior and his name may have been the source of the speculation on his name and its placement as the first *nomen sacrum*.

WORKS CITED

- Alexander, P.S. "Incantations and Books of Magic." In *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* III. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986. Revised English ed.: 342-379.
- Allen, Thomas G. "God the Namer: A Note on Ephesians 1.21b." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 470-475.
- Alon, Gedalyahu. *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*. Trans. by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977.
- Apuleius. *Apologia*. In *The Works of Apuleius comprising the Metemorphoses, or Golden Ass, the God of Socrates, the Florida, and the Defense, or a Discourse on magic. A New Translation. To which are added, A Metrical version of Cupid and Psyche, and Mrs. Tighe's Psyche, a Poem in six cantos*. London: George Bell and Sons, York Street, Covent Gardens, 1878.
- Arai Sasagu. *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964.
- Aram Kurt. *Magie & Zauberei in der Alten Welt*. Reprint of 1927 edition. Wiesbaden: Fourier Verlag, 1998.
- Arnold, Clinton E. *Ephesians: Power and Magic The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of its Historical Setting*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Arnold, Clinton E. *The Colossian Syncretism. The Interface Between Christianity and Folk Belief at Colossae*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2 Reihe. Eds. Martin Hengel and Otfried Hofius. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995.
- Ashraf Iskander Sadek. *Popular Religion in Egypt during the New Kingdom*. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1987.
- Attridge, W. Harold and George W. MacRae S.J. "The Gospel of Truth I,3:16.31-43.24." In *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex)*. Ed. Harold W. Attridge. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985: 39-135.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia Commentary Series. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.

Aune, David Edward. *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972.

_____. "Magic in Early Christianity." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.23.2 Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980: 1507-57.

_____. "Ιαω." In *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der Antiken Welt*. Band XVII. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1996: 1-11.

_____. *Revelation 17-22*. Word Biblical Commentary 52c. Eds. Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Baker. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Pub., 1998.

Baltzer, K. "Namenglaube II. im Alten Testament." In *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 3rd Ed., V. 4. Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr, 1960:1302-1303.

Barbel, Joseph. *Christos Angelos: Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Ursprungs und der Fortdauer des Arianismus*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1941.

Barrett, C.K. "Faith and Eschatology in Acts 3." In *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für W. G. Kümmel*. Eds. Erich Grässer and O. Merk. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985: 1-17.

Barth Gerhard. "Taufe auf den Namen Jesu. Kurzbericht über den Stand neutestamentlicher Arbeiten zum Verständnis der Taufe im Urchristentum." In *Neutestamentliche Versuche und Beobachtungen*. Waltrop Germany: Hartmut Spenner, 1996: 45-64.

Basanoff, V. *EVOCATIO: Étude d'un rituel militaire Romain*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1947.

Bauckham Richard. "Sabbath and Sunday in the Post-Apostolic Church." In *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation*. Grand Rapids Mich.: Zondervan, 1982: 252-298.

_____. "Pseudo-Apostolic Letters." *Journal of Biblical Literature* v. 107 (1988): 469-494.

_____. *The Climax of Prophecy*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993.

- _____. "The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11." In *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*. Eds. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd. Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998: 128-139.
- Baur, Walter, William Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, "αἰτέω," in *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd ed. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1958: 25-26.
- Baumgartner Walter. *Zum Alten Testament und Seiner Umwelt: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959.
- Baxter, Timothy M.S. *The Cratylus: Plato's Critique of Naming*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.
- Beale G.K. *The Book of Revelation. A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1999.
- Benko, Stephen. *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Berger Klaus. "Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel." *NTS* 17 (1971): 391-425.
- Besnard, A.M. *Le Mystère du Nom. Quiconque invoquera le nom de Seigneur sera sauvé. Joël 3,5. Lectio Divina 35*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1962.
- Best Ernest. *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1972.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation including the Demotic Spells*. 2nd Edition. V. 1 Texts. Ed. Hans Dieter Betz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- _____. "Secrecy in the Greek Magical Papyri." In *Secrecy and Concealment: Studies in the History of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Religions*. Eds. Hans S. Kippenberg and Guy G. Stroumsa. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995: 153-175.
- Bietenhard, H. "ὄνομα." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. V (1954): 242-281.
- Bischoff Erich. *Die Mystik und Magie der Zahlen*. Berlin: Hermann Barsdorf Verlag, 1920.

Blass Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Friedrich Rehkopf. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. 16th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Blau, Ludwig. *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*. Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck, 1974. Reprint of 1898 edition.

Böcher, Otto. *Christus Exorcista. Dämonismus und Taufe im Neuen Testament*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1972.

Bohak, Gideon. "Greek-Hebrew Gematrias in 3 Baruch and in Revelation." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 7 (1990): 119-121.

Böhmer, Julian. *Das Biblische "Im Namen", eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung über das Hebräische עִשְׂרֵי ; und seine Griechischen Äquivalente (im besonderen Hinblick auf den Taufbefehl Matt. 28: 19)*. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898.

Bonner, Campbell. *Studies in magical amulets chiefly Greco-Roman*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1950.

Bornkamm, Ghnther. "Lobpreis, Bekenntnis und Opfer: Eine alttestamentliche Studie." In *Geschichte und Glaube. Ester Teil. Gesammelte Aufsätze Band III*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968.

_____. "Die Binds-und Lösegalt in der Kirche des Matthäus." In *Die Zeit Jesu. Festschrift für H. Schlier*. Eds. Gunther v. Bornkamm and K. Rahner. Freiburg, Basil, Wien: Herder, 1970: 93-107.

Bourghouts, J.F. *Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978.

Bousset Wilhelm D. *Die Religion des Judentums im Späthellenistischen Zeitalter*. 4th ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 21. Ed. Hugo Gressmann. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966.

_____. *Kurios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Trans. John E. Stealy. New York: Abingdon, 1970.

Brashear, William. "The Greek Magical Papyri: an Introduction and Survey; Annotated Bibliography (1928-1994)." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt Part II, 18.2*. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994: 3381-3657.

- Braumann, Georg. *Vorpaulinische christliche Taufverkündigung bei Paulus*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1962.
- Brelich, Angelo. *Die Geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom*. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1949.
- Brooks, Stephenson H. *Matthew's Community: the evidence of his special sayings material*. Sheffield: JSOT Press (JSNT Supplement 16), 1987.
- Brongers H.A. "Die Wendung *b'šēm jhwh* im Alten Testament." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. V.77 # 1 (1965): 1-20.
- Brown, Schuyler. "Concerning the Origin of the Nomina Sacra." *Studia Papyrologica* 9 (1970): 7-19.
- Brown Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John (i-xii)*. The Anchor Bible Commentary. 2nd Ed. Garden City, New York: Double Day & Company, Inc., 1983.
- Brown, Colin. "Ernst Lohmeyer's *Kyrios Jesus*." In *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*. Eds. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd. Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998: 6-42.
- Bruce F.F. "Kerygma of Hebrews." *Interpretation*, 23 (1969): 3-19.
- _____. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. V. 45. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco Texas: Word Books, 1982.
- Budge, E.A. Wallis. *Egyptian Magic*. New York: University Books, 1899.
- Bultmann Rudolph. *A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*. 2nd Ed. Trans. R. Philip O'Hara, Lane C. McGauhy and Robert W. Funk. Ed. Robert W. Funk. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973.
- Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press & Basil Blackwell, 1985.
- Capes, David B. *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992.

Cartledge Tony W. *Vows in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Sheffield: J.S.O.T. Press, 1992.

Cerfaux L. "L'hymne au Christ-Serviteur de Dieu (Phil. 2,6-11=Is 52,13-53,12)." In *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux. Vol. II. Etudes d'Exégèse et d'Histoire Religieuse*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium VI-VII. Gembloux: éditions J. Ducolot, 1954: 425-437.

Charlesworth, James H. "The Odes of Solomon." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. V. 2. Ed. James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1985: 725-774.

_____. "Prayer of Manasseh." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. V. 2. Ed. James Charlesworth. Garden City: Double Day, 1983-1985:

Chilton Bruce D. *The Isaiah Targum, Introduction, Translation, Apparatus, and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible V. 11. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.

Clodd Edward. *Magic in Names and Other Things*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1920.

Cohon, Samuel S. "The Name of God, A Study of Rabbinic Theology." *Hebrew Union College Annual Part I*, 23 (1950-51):579-604.

Contenau G. "De la valeur du nom chez Babyloniens et de quelques-unes de ses consequences." *RHR* 81 (1920): 316

Conzelmann, Hans. *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. 3rd ed. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960.

_____. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

Croatto Severino, J. "Die relecture des Jahwe-Namens. Hermeneutische Überlegungen zu Ex 3,1-15 und 6,2-13." *Evangelische Theologie* v. 51 (1991):39-49.

Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

_____. "Alle, die den Namen unseres Herrn Jesus Christus anrufen." In *Vorträge und Aufsätze 1925-1962*. Ed. Karlfriend von Fröhlich. Tübingen, Mohr (Siebeck); Zurich, Zwingli Verlag, 1966: 605-622.

- Daniel Robert and Franco Maltomini, eds. *Supplementum Magicum* # 63. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1992.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. Chicago: The Henry Regnery Co., 1964
- Davids Peter H. *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1982.
- Davies, Carl Judson. *The Name and Way of the Lord*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew V. I-III*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- De Boer, P.A.H. "Numbers VI 27." *Vetus Testamentum* 32 (1982): 3-13.
- Deichgräber, Reinhard. *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Deissmann, Adolf G. *Bibelstudien. Beiträge zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften zur Geschichte der Sprache, des Schrifttums und der Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und des Urchristentums*. Marburg: N.G. Elwert'sche, 1895.
- Delling Gerhard. *Die Zueignung des Heils in der Taufe. Eine Untersuchung zum neutestamentlichen „taufen auf den Namen.“* Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961.
- De Vaux Roland. "Le lieu que Yahvé a choisi pour y établit son nom." In *Das Ferne und Nahe Wort. Festschrift Leonard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres am 30. November 1966 Gewidmet*. Ed. Fritz Maass. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1967: 219-228.
- Dibelius Martin. *James, A Commentary on the Epistle of James*. Trans. Michael A. Williams and Rev. Heinrich Greeven. Ed. Helmut Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Dieterich Albrecht. *Eine Mithrasliturgie*. 3rd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.
- Dirks, Walter. "Wo zwei oder drei . Überlegungen zu Mt 18,20." In *Die Neue Gemeinde. Festschrift für Theodor Filthaut zum 60 Geburtstag. Unter Mitarbeit von Walter Dirks und Johann Baptist Metz*. Ed. Adolf Exeler. Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald, 1968: 23-33.

- Dix Gregory Dom, *The shape of the liturgy*; additional notes by Paul V. Marshall. New York : The Seabury Press, 1982.
- Dodd, C.H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Dornseiff, F. *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*. Stoicheia #7. Leipzig-Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1925.
- Duhm, Hans. *Der Verkehr Gottes mit den Menschen im Alten Testament*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1926.
- Duling, Dennis C. "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David." *HTR* 68 (1975):235-252.
- _____. "The Eleazar Miracle and Solomon's Magical Wisdom in Flavius Josephus' *Antiquitates Judaicae* 8.42-49." *Harvard Theological Review* v. 78.1 (1985): 1-25.
- Dunn, James D.G. *Christology in the making : a New Testament inquiry into the origins of the doctrine of the incarnation*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 1996.
- _____. "Christ, Adam, and Preexistence." In *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*. Eds. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd. Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998: 74-83.
- Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament, Vol. 1,2*. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1961-1967.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. "Jahwe-Name und Zauberwesen." In *Kleine Schriften Ersten Band*. Ed. Rudolf Sellheim and Fritz Maass. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1962.
- Eitrem, S. *Some notes on the Demonology in the New Testament*. *Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. Supplet. XII*. Oslo: Typis Expressit A.W. Brøgger, 1950.
- _____. *Papyri Osloenses Fasc. I, Magical Papyri*. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi I Oslo, 1925.
- Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993.

Evans, Craig A. *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation*. Peabody Mass.: Hendrickson, 1992.

Faraone Christopher A. "The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells." In *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic & Religion*. Ed. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Farby Heinz-Josef Fabry. "אֱשֶׁר." *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Band VIII*. Eds. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Helmer Ringgren. Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln: W. Kohlhammer: 122-176.

Fee, Gordon. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987.

Feld, Helmut. "Der Hebräerbrief: literarische Form, religionsgeschichtlicher Hintergrund, theologische Fragen." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Principat 25,4, (1987): 3522-3601.

Fossum, Jarl E. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985.

_____. "Kyrios Jesus as the Angel of the Lord in Jude 5-7." *NTS* 33 (1987): 226-243.

_____. "In the Beginning Was the Name: Onomanology As the Key to Johannine Christology." In *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*. Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Freiburg/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.

Gagner, John G. *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.

_____. *Curse Tablets and Binding spells from the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Galling Kurt. "Die Ausrufung des Namens als Rechtsakt in Israel." *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. Nummer 2, 81Jahrgang, Februar (1956): 65-70.

Garrett Susan. *The Demise of the Devil. Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1989.

- Geller, Markham, J. "Jesus' Theurgic Powers: Parallels in the Talmud and Incantation Bowls." *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 28 (1977):141-155.
- Georgi Dieter. "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2,6-11." In *Zeit und Geschichte; Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtsag*. Ed. Erich Dinkler. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1964: 263-293.
- Giesebrecht, Fr. *Die Alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre Religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage*. Königsberg: Von Thomas & Oppermann, 1901.
- Giversen Søren. "Evangelium Veritatis and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Studia Theologica* 13.2 (1959): 87-96.
- Gladigow Burkhard, "Struktur der Öffentlichkeit und Bekenntnis in Polytheistischen Religionen." In *Secrecy and Concealment*. Studies in the History of Religions # 65. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995: 17-35.
- _____. "Gottesnamen I." *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der Antiken Welt*. Band 11. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, (1996): 1202-1238.
- Glasson, T.F. "'Plurality of Divine Persons' and the Quotations in Hebrews I. 6 ff." *New Testament Studies* 12 (1966): 270-272.
- Gnilka Joachim. *Der Philipperbrief. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Freiberg: Herder, 1987.
- _____. *Das Evangelium nach Markus. Teilband 2. Mk 8,27-16,20*. Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1979.
- Goldberg, Abraham. "The Mishna-A Study Book of Halakha." In *The Literature of the Sages First Part: Oral Tora, Halakha, Mishna, Tosefta, Talmud External Tractates*. Ed. Shumel Safrai. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Goodenough, E. R. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. V. I-VIII. New York: Pantheon Books, 1953.

- Gordon Richard. "Imagining Greek and Roman Magic." In *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999: 159-266.
- Graf, Fritz. "Prayers in Magical and Religious Ritual." In *MAGIKA HIERA, Ancient Greek Magic & Religion*. Eds. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- _____. *Magic in the Ancient World*. Eng. trans. Franklin Philip. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- _____. *Gottesnähe und Schadenzauber: die Magie in der griechisch-römischen Antike*. München: C.H. Beck Kulturwissenschaft, 1996.
- Gräßer Eric. "Hebräer 1,1-4: Ein exegetischer Versuch." In *Text und Situation, Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1973: 55-71.
- _____. *An der Hebräer. Teilband 1. Hebr. 1-6*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3, Ed. Norbert Brox. Zürich: Benziger Verlag GmbH, 1990.
- Grether, Otto. *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1934.
- Grobel, Kendrick. *The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960.
- Gruenwlad, Ithamar. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980.
- Guggisburg, Fritz. *Die Gestalt des Mal'ak Jahwe im Alten Testament*. Ph.D. Thesis Presented to the Faculté de Théologie l'Université de Neuchâtel. Neuchâtel: von Dach Druck AG, 1979.
- Güntert, Hermann. *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister: Bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Homerischen und Eddischen Göttersprache*. Halle: Max Niemeyer: 1921.
- Guthrie, Donald. *Jesus the Messiah: An Illustrated Life of Christ*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972.

- Haenchen Ernst. *Apostelgeschichte*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament Abt. 3,12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.
- Hahn, F. *Christologische Hoheitstitel; ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Hartman, Lars. "Baptism 'Into the Name of Jesus' and Early Christology." *Studia Theologia*, 28 (1974): 21-48.
- _____. "'Into the Name of Jesus,' A Suggestion concerning the Earliest Meaning of the Phrase." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 432-440.
- _____. *Auf dem Namen des Herrn Jesus: Die Taufe in den neutestamentlichen Schriften*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 148. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992.
- Harvey, A.E. "Christ as Agent." In *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament. Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird*. Eds. L.D. Hurst and N.T. Wright. Oxford: Calendon Press, 1987.
- Hawthorne, Gerald F. "In the Form of God and Equal with God (Philippians 2:6)." In *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*. Eds. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd. Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998: 96-110.
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm. *In Namen Jesu: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe*. FRLANT I,2: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.
- _____. "Namenglauben im NT." In *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart Vol.4*. Eds. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnach. Tübingen: J.C. B. Mohr, 1913: 659-666.
- Hempel, Johannes. "Die Israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte Altorientalischer Parallelen." In *Apoxyismata: Vorarbeiten zu einer Religionsgeschichte und Theologie des Alten Testaments: Festgabe zum 30. Juli 1961*. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1961: 31-55.
- Hess, R. S. "Yahweh and His Asherah? Epigraphic Evidence for Religious Pluralism in old Testament Times." In *One God, One Lord in a World of Religious Pluralism*. Eds. A.D. Clarke and B.W. Winter. Cambridge: Tyndale House, 1991.

- Heylbut, Gustavus. *Aspasii in ethica Nicomachea quae supersunt, commentaria consilio et auctoritate Academiae litterarum regiae borussicae, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* 19.1, (Berlin: Reimer, 1889).
- Hiers, Richard H. "Binding" and "Loosing": The Matthean Authorization." *JBL* 104.2 (1985): 233-250.
- Hirschle Maurus. *Sprachphilosophie und Namenmagie im Neuplatonismus: Mit einem Exkurs zu 'Demokrit' B 142*. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1979.
- Hirzel, Rudolf. *Der Name: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte im Altertum und besonders bei den Griechen*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1962.
- Hofius, Otfried. *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6-11. Untersuchungen zu Gestalt und Aussage eines urchristlichen Psalms*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991.
- Hooker, Morna D. *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.
- Hopfner, Theodor. *Griechisch-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber: Mit einer eingehenden Darstellung des griechisch-synkretistischen Daemonenglaubens und der Voraussetzungen und Mittel des Zaubers überhaupt und der magischen Divination im besonderen*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1974.
- _____. "Mageia (Name)." In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft Band 14 pt. 1*. Eds. Georg Wissowa and Wilhelm Kroll. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlerische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928: 301-393.
- Hornblower Simon and Antony Spawforth, eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Horsley, G.H.R. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity, Vol. 1-5*. Marrickville: Macquarie University, 1984.
- _____. "Name change as an indication of religious conversion in antiquity." *Numen* 34 (1987): 1-17.
- Horst, Friedrich. "Der Eid im Alten Testament." In *Gottes Recht: Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im Alten Testament*. Ed. Hans Walter Wolff. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961: 292-297.

- Horst, Friedrich, "Segen und Segenshandlungen in der Bibel," in *Gottes Recht: Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im Alten Testament*, ed. Hans Walter Wolff. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961: 188-202
- Hull, John, M. *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition*. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- Hurst, Lincoln D. "Christ, Adam, and Preexistence Revisited." In *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*. Eds. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd. Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press:, 1998: 84-95.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *One God One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Christian Monotheism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- _____. "Christ-Devotion in the First Two Centuries: Reflections and a Proposal," *Toronto Journal of Theology* 12/1 (1996): 17-33.
- _____. "The Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*: A Proposal." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117/4 (1998): 655-673.
- Jacob Benno. *Im Namen Gottes: eine sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten und Neuen Testament*. Berlin: S. Calvery & Co., 1903.
- Jacq, C. *Egyptian Magic*. Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1985.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Zur Gedankenführung in den Paulinischen Briefen, Christushymnus Phil. 2:6-11." In *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii*. Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953. :146-154.
- Jones C.P. "Stigma: Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity." *The Journal of Roman Studies* vol. LXXVII (1987): 139-155.
- Judge, E.A. "The Magical use of Scripture in the Papyri." In *Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of Francis I. Andersen's Sixtieth Birthday*. Ed. Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987: 339-349.
- Kákosy, László. *Zauberei im alten Ägypten*. Trans. from the Hungarian by Eszter Szóbel and Ildikó Derzsi. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1989.

Käsemann, Ernst. "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2.5-11." In *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnung: erster Band*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.

Kennel, Werner. *Frühchristliche Hymnen. Gattungskritische Studien zur Frage nach den Liedern der früh Christenheit*. WUNT 71. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.

Kim Seyoon. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1984.

Kittel Gerhard, ed. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, in Verbindung mit Otto Bauernfeind, Friedrich Baumgärtel, Johannes Behm*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1932-1979.

Klutz, Todd E. "The Grammar of Exorcism in the Ancient Mediterranean World: Some Cosmological, Semantic, and Pragmatic Reflections on How Exorcistic Prowess Contributed to the Worship of Jesus." In *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Eds. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999:156-155.

Knight George W. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek text*. The New International Greek Testament commentary. Grand Rapids Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1992.

Koch Klaus. "Monotheismus und Angelologie," in *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der Israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*. Eds. Walter Dirtrich and Martin A. Klopfenstein. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.

Koester, Craig R. *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*. Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989.

König, Eduard. *Theologie des Alten Testaments: kritisch und vergleichend dargestellt*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Chr. Belser, 1923.

Kosmala Hans. "In my Name." In *Studies, Essays and Reviews, Volume Two, New Testament*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978: 25-47.

Kotansky, Roy. "Greek Exorcistic Amulets." In *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*. Eds. Marvin Meyers and Paul Mirecki. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995: 243-278.

- Kramer, Werner. *Christos, Kurios, Gottessohn. Untersuchung zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den vorpaulinischen Gemeinden.* Zurich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1963.
- Kraus Hans-Joachim. *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament: Untersuchungen zu den Liedern von Jahwes Thronbesteigung.* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1951.
- Krauss Meinhold and Johannes Lundbeck. *Die Vielen Namen Gottes.* Stuttgart: J.F. Steinkopf, 1974.
- Kruse Heinz . "Der Wunderbare Name: Zu Herkunft und Sinngehalt des Jahwe-Namens." *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 112 (1990): 385-405.
- Lane, Eugene M. "On the Date of PGM IV." *Second Century* 4:1 (1984):25-27.
- Latte, Kurt. *Römische Religionsgeschichte.* München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlag, 1966.
- Legrand L. "On L'appela du Nom de Jésus (Luc II, 21)." *Revue Biblique* 89 (1982): 481-492.
- Lehmkuiler, Karsten. *Kultus und Theologie: Dogmatik und Exegese in der religionsgeschichtlichen Schule.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Leipoldt, Johannes. *Von den Mysterien zur Kirche.* Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1961.
- Lesses Rebecca Macy. *Ritual Practices to Gain Power: Angels, Incantations, and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism.* Harrisburg: Harvard Theological Studies Trinity Press, 1998.
- Lichtenberger Hermann. "Synkretistische Züge in jüdischen und judenchristlichen Taufbewegungen." In *Jews and Christians: The parting of the ways A.D. 70 to 135.* The Second Durham Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament Band 66. Ed. James D.G. Dunn. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992.
- Lightstone, Jack N. *The Commerce of the Divine: mediation of the divine among Jews in the Greco-Roman Diaspora.* Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.

- Lincoln Andrew. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary V. 42. Dallas TX.: Word Books, 1990.
- Loader, William R.G. *Sohn und Hoherpriester. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefes*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 53. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.
- Lohfink Gerhard. "Gab es im Gottesdienst der neutestamentlichen Gemeinden eine Anbetung Christi." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 18.2 (1974): 169.
- _____. "»Meinen Namen zu tragen... « (Apg 9,15)." In *Studien zum Neuen Testament*. Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände 5. Eds. Gerhard Dautzenberg and Norbert Lohfink. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990: 213-221.
- Lohmyer, Ernst. *Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5-11*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaft. Phil.-hist. Kl., Jahr. 1927-28, 4. Abh.
- Lona, Horacio E. „In meinen Namen versammelt." *Archives of Liturgy* 37 (1995): 373-404.
- Longenecker, Richard. *The Christology of Jewish-Christianity*. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- Lowe, Joyce Egerton. *Magic in Greek and Latin Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1929.
- Luck Georg. *Arcana Mundi: Magic and Occult in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- _____. "Witches and Sorcerers in Classical Literature." In *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*. Eds. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999: 91-156.
- Lüdemann Gerd. *Die "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule." Facetten eines theologischen Umbruchs*. Studien und Texte zur religionsgeschichtlichen Schule Band 1. Ed. Gerd Lüdemann. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Da Evangelium nach Matthäus. Teilband 3. Mt 18,1-25,46*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Ed. Norbert Brox, in connection with Otto Böcher. Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1997.
- MacDonald, J. *The Theology of the Samaritans*. London: S.C.M., 1964.

- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Christianizing the Roman Empire A.D. 100-400*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- MacMullen, Ramsay, and Eugene N. Lane. *Paganism and Christianity 100-425 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- MacRae George W., "The Gospel of Truth (I, 3 and XII, 2)," In *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 37-49. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.
- Martin Ralph P. *James*. Word Biblical Commentary. V. 48. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1988.
- Martin, Ralph P. *A Hymn of Christ. Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1997.
- Martínez Florentino García, Eibert J.C. and Adam S. van der Woude Tigchelaar, eds. *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*. Oxford : Clarendon, 1955-1998.
- Martínez Florentino García and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea scrolls study edition*. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997-1998.
- Mayser, Edwin. *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit: mit Einschluss der Gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten Verfassten Inschriften*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1923.
- McBride Dean S. *The Deuteronomic Name Theology*. Ph.D. Dissertation Harvard University, Ann Arbor Michigan: UMI, 1969.
- McKenzie John L. "Cult." In *The Flowering of Old Testament: A Reader in Twentieth-Century Old Testament Theology, 1930-1990*. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study. Old Testament series 1. Eds. Ben C. Oilemburger, Elmer A. Martens and Gerhard F. Hasel. Winona Lake Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- McKenzie Peter. *The Christians: Their Beliefs and Practices*. Nashville: Abingdon press, 1988.
- Meeks, Wayne A. and Robert L. Wilkens. *Jews and Christians in Antioch: In the First Four Centuries of the Common Era*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Mehlmann, Johannes. *Der "Name" Gottes im Alten Testament*. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1956.

Merkelbach, Reinhold and Maria Totti. *Abrasax: ausgewählte papyri religiösen und magischen inhalts Band I*. Obladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1990.

Mettinger N.D. Tryggve. *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. Trans. by Frederick H. Cryer. Uppsala, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1982.

_____. *In Search of God. The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names*. Trans. Frederick H. Cryer. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

Metzger, Bruce M. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Palaeography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Michel, Otto. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. 8th ed. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament v. 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Michel Otto, "ὁμολογέω," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. V. 5 (1954): 199-220.

Millard, Alan. "Ancient Abbreviations and the *Nomina Sacra*." In *The Unbroken Reed. Studies in Culture and Heritage of Ancient Egypt, In Honor of A.F. Shore*, Eds. C. Eyre, A. Leahy, L.M. Leahy. London: The Egyptian Exploration Society, 1994.

Miller, Patricia Cox. "In Praise of Nonsense." In *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*, 481-505. Ed. A.H. Armstrong. New York: Crossroads, 1986:

Montgomery, J.M. *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. The Museum: Publications of the Babylonian Section v. III. 1913.

Morgen, Michael. A. *Sepher Ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.

Motte, Jochen. *Biblische Theologie nach Walter Zimmerli: Darstellung und Whrdigung der alttestamentlichen Theologie Walter Zimmerlis und der sich aus ihr ergebenden Perspektive zum Neuen Testament in systematisch-theologischer Sicht*. Frankfurt am Main: Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1995.

Mowinckel Sigmund. *Religion und Kultus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953.

_____. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship V.I*. Trans. D. R. Ap-Thompson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.

- Müller, C. Detlef G. "Gottesnamen IV." *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der Antiken Welt*. Band 11 Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1996: 1238-1278.
- Nagata, Takeshi. *Philippians 2:5-11: A Case Study in the Contextual Shaping of Early Christianity*. PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary. Ann Arbor Mich.: UMI Dissertation Services, 1981.
- Nägelsbach, D. Friedrich. *Der Name Gottes und Jesu nach dem Verständnis und dem Sprachgebrauch der Heiligen Schrift*. München: Müller & Fröhlich, 1921.
- Naveh, Joseph, and Shaul Shaked. *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985.
- Neufeld Vernon H. *The Earliest Christian Confessions*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- Niehr, Herbert. "JHWH als Arzt, Herkunft und Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gottesprädikation." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 35.1 (1991): 3-17.
- Niles Daniel Prem. *The Name of God in Israel's Worship: The Theological Importance of the Name Yahweh*. Ph.D. dissertation. Princeton Theological Seminary. Ann Arbor Mich: U.M.I. Dissertation Services, 1998.
- Noack, Bent. *SATANÁS und SOTERÍA: Untersuchungen zur Neutestamentlichen Dämonologie*. København: G.E.C.Gads Forlag, 1948.
- Nock, A.D. "Studies in the Greco-Roman Beliefs of the Empire." *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* 45 (1925): 84-101.
- _____. "Greek Magical Papyri." In *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, Vol. 1*. Ed. Zeph Stewart. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972: 176-194.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 9:21-18:34*. Volume 35B. Ed. Ralph Martin. Dallas TX: Word Books Publisher, 1993.
- Nötscher Frierich. "Epiklese in biblischer Beleuchtung." In *Vom Alten zum Neuen Testament Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1962

- O'Brien, Peter Thomas. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek text*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991.
- Ogden Daniel. "Binding Spells: Curse Tablets and Voodoo Dolls in the Greek and Roman Worlds." In *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*. Eds. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark, 1-86. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Ollenburger, Ben C. *Zion, city of the great king: a theological symbol of the Jerusalem cult*. Sheffield: J.S.O.T. Press, 1987.
- Olyan, Saul. *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: exegesis and the naming of angels in ancient Judaism*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum #36. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1993.
- Paul, Shalom M. *Amos: A Commentary on the Book of Amos*. Ed. Frank Moore Cross. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Pederson Johs. *Der Eid bei Den Semiten in seinem Verhältnis zu Vervandten Erscheinungen sowie die Stellung des Eides im Islam*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1914.
- Percy Ernst. *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der Johanneischen Theologie: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Gnostizismus*. Lund: Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandeln, 1939.
- Perlewitz, Lois Ann. *A Christology of the Book of Acts: Modes of Presence*. PH.D. Disstertation, Saint Louis, University. Ann Arbor Mich.: U.M.I., 1977.
- Pesch, Rudolf. *Die Apostelgeschichte. EKK evang.-kath. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Ed. Josef Blank, in connection with Otto Böcher. Zürich: Benziger: 1986.
- Peterson, Erik. *ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.
- Pétrément, Simon. *The Christian Origins of Gnosticism*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1984.
- Pfeifer, Gerhard. *Ursprung und Wesen der Hypostasenvorstellungen im Judentum*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1967.
- Phillips III, C.R. "Nullum Crimen sine Lege: Socioreligious Sanctions on Magic." In *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*. Eds. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink, 260-276. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

- Pinch, Geraldine. *Magic in Ancient Egypt*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994.
- Powell, John U. *Collectanea Alexandrina*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925.
- Preisendanz, Karl. *Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Leipzig and Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1931.
- Prümm, Karl. *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch für den Raum der Altchristlichen Umwelt*. Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut, 1954.
- Puech, E. "11QPsAp: Un Rituel D'Exorcismes. Essai de Reconstruction." *Revue de Qumran* 14 No.55 (1990): 377-408.
- Pulleyn, Simon. "The Power of Names in Classical Greek Religion." *Classical Quarterly* 44 (1994):17-25.
- Richards, Randolph E. *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991.
- Rissi, Mathias. *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs: Ihre Verankerung in der Situation des Verfassers und seiner Leser*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987.
- Rissi, Mathias. "Der Christushymnus in Phil 2, 6-11." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang in der Römischen Welt, Religion*, 25.4 (1987): 3314-3326.
- Ritner, Robert K. "Egyptian Magical Practice under the Roman Empire: the Demotic Spells and their Religious Context." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, Part II*, 18.2. Ed. Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase, 3333-3379. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1994.
- Roberts, Colin H. *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Rordorf, Willy. *Sunday: the history of the day of rest and worship in the earliest centuries of the Christian church*. Translated by A. A. K. Graham from the German. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.
- Rose H.J. "Divine Names in Classical Greece." *Harvard Theological Review* 51 (1958): 3-32.

- Röttger, Hermann. *Mal'ak Jahwe - Bote von Gott: die Vorstellung von Gottes Boten im hebraische Alten Testament*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 1978.
- Ruck-Schröder, Adelheid. *Der Name Gottes und der Name Jesu: Eine neutestamentliche Studie. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999.
- Rudolph, Kurt. *Gnosis. The Nature and History of Gnosticism*. Trans. Robert McL. Wilson. San Francisco: Harper, 1987.
- Runia D.T. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. Philosophia Antiqua 44. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986.
- Schäfer Peter. *Rivalität Zwischen Engeln und Menschen. Untersuchungen zur Rabbinischen Engelvorstellung*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1975.
- Schäfer, Peter. *Der verborgene und offenbar Gott: Hauptthemen der frühen jüdischen Mystik*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991.
- Schenk, Wolfgang. "Der Philipperbrief in der neueren Forschung (1945-1985)." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Principat 25,4 (1987): 3280-3313.
- Scherer, James A. "Missiologial Naming: 'Who shall I Say Sent Me?'," In *Our Naming of God: Problems and Prospects of God-Talk Today*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989: 111-125.
- Schmidt, Carl. *Gespräche Jesu mit seiner Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*. TU 43. Leipzig: Reprografischer Nachdruck, 1919.
- Schmidt Hans. "Namenglauben im AT." In *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart Vol.4*. Eds. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnach. Tübingen: J.C. B. Mohr, 1913: 659-661.
- Schmidt, K.L. "ἐπικαλέω" in *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. 3 (1954): 496-500.
- Schmidt Werner H., *Die Zehn Gebote im Rahmen Alttestamentlicher Ethick, in Zusammenarbeit mit Holger Delkurt und Axel Graupner*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993.

- Schmidt, Wilhelm. *Die Bedeutung des Namens im Kult und Aberglauben: Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Volkskunde*. Darmstadt: G. Otto Hofbuchdruckerei, 1912.
- Schnackenburg Rudolf, *Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus. Eine Studie zur Paulinische Theologie. Mhnen Theologische Studien*, 1. Historische Abteilung, Band 1. Eds. Franz Xaver Seppelt, Joseph Pascher, and Klaus Mörsdorf. München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1950.
- _____. *Der Brief an die Epheser*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament Band 10. Ed. Josef Blank. Zürich; Einsieden; Köln: Benziger Verlag and Neukirchen-Vlurn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982.
- Scholem Gershom G. *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960.
- Schirrie, T. *Hebrew Amulets*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Schüngel-Straumann, H. "Überlegungen zum Jahwe-Namen in den Gottesgeboten des Dekalogs." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 38.2 (March/April 1982): 65-77.
- Schwartz Eduard. *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln*. Phil. Hist. Klasse, Serie 8:6. Berlin: Abhandlung der Königl. Berlin: Weidmann, 1905.
- Schwartz, Jacques. "Papyri Magicae Graecae und Magische Gemmen." In *Die Orientalischen Religionen im Römerreich*, Ed. Maarten J. Vermaseren. Leiden: E.J. Brill: 1981:485-509.
- Segal, Alan. *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.
- Seidel, Jonathan Lee. *Studies in Ancient Jewish Magic*. PhD. University of California, Berkeley, 1996. Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Dissertation Service, 1997.
- Simon, Marcel. *Verus Israel: a study of the relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425)*. Translated from the French by H. McKeating. New York : Published for the Littman Library by Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Smalley Stephen S. *1,2,3, John*. Word Biblical Commentary V.51. Waco Texas: Word Books, 1984.
- Smith Morton. *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

- _____. "The Cult of YHWH." In *New Testament, Early Christianity, and Magic Vol. 2*. Ed. Shaye J.D. Cohen. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- Staats, Reinhart. "Ogdoas als ein Symbol für die Auferstehung." *Vigiliae Christianae* 26.1 (1972): 29-52.
- Stade Bernhard. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel II, Allgemeine geschichte in einzeldarstellugen*. Ed. Wilhelm Oncken. Berlin: G. Grote, 1887-1888.
- Stegemann, Harmut. "Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten." In *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Ed. M. Delcor et. al. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium XLVI. Paris : Duculot Leuvan: University Press, 1978: 195-217.
- Stern, Menahem. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980.
- Steyn, G.J. "To Onoma tou Kyriou in I Cor." In *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Ed. R. Bieringer, 479-490. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CXXV. Louvain: Leuven Univ Pr., 1996.
- Stoebe Hans Joachim. *Das zweite Buch Samuelis*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1994.
- Strack H.L. and P. Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum die Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. München: C.H. Beck, 1922-28.
- Strimple R.B. "Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Studies: Some Exegetical Conclusions." *Westminster Theological Journal* 41 (1979): 247-268.
- Swartz Michael D. *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: an analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992.
- Swetnam, James. "Malachi 1,11: An Interpretation." *Catholic Biblical Quartely* 31 (1969):200-209.
- Tambiah, S.J. "The Magical Power of Words." *Man* 3 (1968): 175-208.
- Taylor, Thomas. *Iamblichus On the Mysteries of the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Assyrians*. Trans. by Thomas Taylor. 3rd edition. Ed. R.I. Robb. San Diego: Wizards Bookshelf, March 1997; reprint of second edition, London: Bertram Dobell, 1895.

- Tidiman, Brian. *Les Livres d'Aggee et de Malachie*. Éditions de la Faculté Libre de Théologie Évangélique. VAUX-sur-SEINE, France: Edifac, 1993.
- Tournay, R. "LE PSAUME VIII ET LA DOCTRINE BIBLIQUE DU NOM." *Revue Biblique* 78 (1971): 18-30.
- Trachtenburg, Joshua. *Jewish magic and superstition; a study in folk religion*. New York: Atheneum, 1970.
- Trilling Wolfgang. *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher Band XIV*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Eds. Josef Blank, Rudolf Schnackenburg, Eduard Schweizer, and Ulrich Wilkens. Zürich, Einsiedeln, and Köln: Benziger Verlag and Neukirchener Verlag, 1980.
- Turner, M.M.B. "The Spirit of Christ and Christology." In *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology presented to Donald Guthrie*. Ed. Harold H. Rowdon, 168-190. Leicester; Downers Grove Ill.: I.V.P. Press, 1982.
- Ulrichsen, Jarl Henning. "Διαφορώτερον ὄνομα in Hebr. 1,4 Christus als Träger des Gottesnamens." *Studia Theologica* 38 (1984): 65-75.
- Untergaßmair, Franz Georg. *In Namen Jesu-Der Namensbegriff im Johannesevangelium: eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den johanneischen Namensausagen*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974.
- Untergaßmair, Franz Georg. *Im Namen Jesu beten: biblische Impluse zu christlichem Gebet*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990.
- Urbach, Ephraim E. *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*. 2nd ed. Trans. Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979.
- Van der Horst P.W. "Peter's Shadow. The religio-historical background of Acts V.15." *NTS* 23: 204-212.
- Van der Woude, A.S. "Gibt es eine Theologie des Jahwe-Namens im Deuteronomium?" In *Übersetzung und Deutung: Studien zu dem Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt Alexander Reinhard Hulst gewidmet von Freuden und Kollegen*. Nijkerk: Uitgeverij G.F. and Callenbach B.V., 1977.
- Van Unnik W.C. "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament." In *The Jung codex, a newly recovered Gnostic papyrus; three studies*. Ed. F. L. Cross, 79-129. London, Mowbray; New York, Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1955.

_____. "With all those who call on the Name of the Lord." In *New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke, V. II*. Ed. William C. Weinrich, 533-551. Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 1984.

Versnel, Hendrik Simon. "Die Poetik der Zaubersprüche." In *Die Macht des Wortes*. Eds. Tilo Schabert & Rémi Brague, 233-297. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1996.

Von Campenhausen Freiherr Hans. "Taufen auf den Namen Jesu?" *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (1971): 1-16.

Von Rad, Gerhard. *Theologie des Alten Testaments. Band I. Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962.

_____. *Das fünfte Buch Mose-Deuteronomium*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.

Von Rehm Martin. "Das Offer der Völker nach Mal. 1,11." In *Lex tua veritas: Festschrift für Hubert Junker zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 8. August 1961, dargeboten von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*. Eds. H. Gross and F. Musser, 193-208. Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1961.

Vriezen, Th. C. "How to Understand Malachi 1:11." In *Grace upon Grace: Essays in Honor of Lester J. Kuyper*. Ed. James I. Cook, 128-136. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975.

Wald, Stephen G. *The Doctrine of the Divine Name: An Introduction to classical Kabbalistic Theology*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

Wallis, R.T. *Neoplatonism*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1972: 13

Weber, Otto. *Dämonenbeschwörung bei den Babyloniern und Assyriern: Eine Skizze*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Weippert, Helga. "Der Ort, den Jahwe erwählen wird, um dort seinen Namen wohnen zu lassen: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Formel." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 24.1 (1980): 76-94.

Wengst, Klaus. *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*. Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1967.

- Westphal, Gustav. *Jahwes Wohnstätten nach den Anschauungen der alten Hebräer: Eine alttestamentliche Untersuchung*. Gießen: Von Alfred Töpelmann, 1908.
- Wetters Gillis, *Altchristliche Liturgien II: Das christliche Opfer neue Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahls*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922.
- Wilhelms Eino. "Der fremde Exorzist [Mk 9:38-42]." *Studia Theologica* 3 (1951): 162-171.
- Williams Michael. *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Wünsch, Richard. *Antike Fluchtafeln, herausgegeben und erklärt von Richard Wünsch*. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1912.
- Yamauchi, Edwin. *Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Proposed Evidences*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 1973.
- Yamauchi, Edwin. "Magic or Miracle? Diseases, Demons and Exorcisms." In *Gospel Perspectives: The Miracles of Jesus*. V. 6. Ed. David Wenham and Craig Blomberg. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986.
- Ziesler, J.A. "The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles." *JSNT* 4 (1979): 28-41.